

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY.

VOL. II.

No. 7.

I.—ON THE ORIGIN OF “HAD RATHER GO” AND ANALOGOUS OR APPARENTLY ANALOGOUS LOCUTIONS.

Of the verb *have*, Dr. Johnson, in his *Dictionary*, gives, as the seventeenth definition, “to wish, to desire, in a lax sense,”¹ and adds, by way of exemplification, the familiar Biblical passage: “I *had* rather be a doorkeeper,” etc.²

A still more disparaging opinion, perhaps a maturer, he records under the adverb *rather*, where, as introductory to a sentence containing the phrase “he *had rather* mankind should adore him,” after premising “*to have rather*,” defined by “to desire in preference,” he remarks: “This is, I think, a barbarous expression, of late intrusion into our language,” for which it is better to say *will*

¹ That *have*, when it bears this signification, comes “from the Lat. *aveo*,” is the remarkable information appended to these words by one of Dr. Johnson’s editors, Archdeacon Todd.

Dr. Latham cuts down the Archdeacon’s definition and etymology to “wish, desire,” and retains the Psalmic exemplification, which must mean, for anything that appears to the contrary, “I *wished rather to be*,” etc.!

² *Psalm* lxxxiv, 10. Compare “I *had* rather speak,” etc., 1 *Corinthians*, xiv, 19. The Victorian revisionists are content with “*had*” there.

³ This, in the estimation of Horne Tooke, is said “most ignorantly”; a denunciation for reasons which are left unexpressed, and which it is difficult to conjecture. For Tooke does not offer to show that the expression commented on is not barbarous, or that it is of long standing; nor does he propose any analysis or vindication of it whatever.

U or M

*rather.*⁴ Of *to have rather*, in the sense of it which he contemplates,⁵ or of *has rather*, cognate to it, he neglects to adduce an instance, though, of course, he should have adduced one.⁶

However, what Dr. Johnson was pleased to "think" on any point of English of which the just ruling demands a somewhat industrious inspection of our older authors, is hardly of noticeable import. "I have fixed Sidney's work for the boundary beyond which I make few excursions," he informs us.⁷ How, then, was he to know, unless by good hap, or at second hand, that *had rather*, used as in the Bible,⁸ had, at the time he conceived it to be "of

⁴ How, one wonders, would Dr. Johnson have proposed to deal with the old "I have liefer go" and "I have as lief go," if he had known the expressions? Would he have struck out their *have*?

⁵ *To have rather*, meaning, according to Dr. Johnson's notion, as above, has been found. This will be seen by and by.

It is worth noting that *rather*, for "somewhat," though not recognized by Dr. Johnson,—I remember his quotation from Dryden,—was in vogue in his day, and was not unknown, many generations earlier, in a sense which, also, he overpasses.

"I praid for it as a straunger schulde doo, alle be it myn autorite is as grete as theris, and *rather* more, as I tolde you." William Worcester (1460), in the *Paston Letters*, vol. I, p. 508. It is, in all other cases, as here, Mr. James Gairdner's admirable edition of the *Paston Letters*, published in 1872-1875, that I refer to.

"They be delyveryd hym in as good, and *rather* better, plyght than whan I had them forthe," etc. Sir John Paston (1474), *ibid.*, vol. III, p. 115. Four pages on, the same writer again has "*rather* better."

In these passages, *rather* signifies "not only so, but."

"After dinner, with my wife to the Duke's Theatre, and saw the second part of 'Rhodes,' done with the new Roxalana, which do [Pepysian for 'does'] it *rather* better, in all respects, for person, voice, and judgment, than the first Roxalana." Samuel Pepys (1662), *Diary*, etc. (ed. 1876), vol. II, p. 109. "*Rather* harder," etc. *Id.*, *ibid.*, vol. III, p. 254 (1665); vol. V, p. 174 (1668).

See also Aubrey (1680), in Bliss's *Letters*, etc. (1813), vol. II, p. 394. But *rather*, as in question, did not become common till the age of Swift and Pope.

Dr. Johnson himself, as a few minutes' search revealed to me, has *rather*, "somewhat," repeatedly, as in the *Idler*, No. 29.

⁶ A comment in which Dr. Johnson treats *had rather* as analogous to *had better* will be cited in due course.

⁷ As he was of opinion that our language, in the days of Sir Thomas More, was "in a great degree formed and settled," his ignoring it so largely as he did, and especially as found in the pages of Tyndale, can ill be reconciled with consistency.

⁸ As has been pointed out, Dr. Johnson writes, in *Kasselas*: "I *had rather* hear thee dispute." Landor, *Life and Works* (1876), vol. IV, p. 210.

M 70 U

late intrusion into our language," been in existence some three centuries,⁹ and, most likely, for a still longer period?

Miss Harriet Martineau is alleged to have written: "I knew a gentleman in America, who told me how much *rather* he *had be* a woman than the man he is."¹⁰ And this "*rather he had be*," many would contend, is no more incorrect than "*he had rather be*." For, according to the current view regarding the latter phrase, its *had* is an auxiliary verb, and so cannot be coupled with an infinitive. Thus argued Thomas Sheridan,¹¹ in 1784: "'I *had rather*.' This phrase is strangely ungrammatical. *Rather* means 'more willingly.' Now, let us substitute the one in the place of the other,—as, 'I *had more willingly go* than *stay*,'—and its impropriety would be manifest. The adverb *rather* is expressive of an act of the will, and, therefore, should be joined to the verb *to will*, and not to the auxiliary, *to have*. Instead of 'I *had rather*', it should be 'I *would rather*.'" Sheridan's pretence of assigning a reason need not detain me.

Bishop Lowth remarks, in his *Short Introduction to English Grammar*:¹² "It has been very rightly observed, that the verb *had*, in the common phrase 'I *had rather*', is not properly used either as an active or as an auxiliary verb; that, being in the past time, it cannot, in this case, be properly expressive of time present; and that it is by no means reducible to any grammatical construction. In truth, it seems to have arisen from a mere mistake, in resolving the familiar and ambiguous abbreviation 'I'd rather' into 'I *had rather*', instead of 'I *would rather*', which latter is the regular, analogous [read analogical], and proper expression."

Later grammarians and lexicographers, in general, accept this solution; and the editors of *Webster's Dictionary* go so far as confidently to pronounce *had rather*, *had as lief*, and *had better* to

Landor fables Dr. Johnson to have replied, on hearing this passage repeated: "I hope you do not very often find such inaccuracies in my writings. Can you point out another?"

The following passage must have escaped Landor: "I am convinced that our ministers . . . *had rather hear* that a thousand merchants," etc. Dr. Johnson, *Debates in Parliament* (ed. 1787), vol. II, p. 12.

⁹ Ample proof of what is implied is furnished in the course of this paper.

¹⁰ Quoted by Mr. Goold Brown, in his *Grammar of English Grammars* (ed. 1873), p. 365.

¹¹ In his edition of *Swift's Works*, vol. II, Preface.

¹² Edition of 1769, p. 79, note 5.

have been, "originally, mere blundering interpretations of the abbreviated form of *would*, as in 'I'd rather,' etc."¹³

Archdeacon Hare, though of opinion that, "according to the principles of our language as now established, the expression 'I had rather do' involves so gross an anomaly, that it would be better to get rid of it,"¹⁴ says, and rightly, with reference to the notion which the editors just quoted are so easily satisfied with: "Plausible, however, as this explanation is, a little search in our ancient writers proves it to be unfounded."¹⁵

Let us now listen to Dr. Alexander Crombie. "All words and phrases," he writes, "which, analysed grammatically, include a solecism, should be dismissed; as, 'I had rather go.' The expression should be 'I would or I'd rather go.' . . . I must observe, also, that the phraseology . . . occurs in some of our earliest writers, and is so frequently found in Pope and Swift, that one is tempted to infer, notwithstanding its solecistic appearance, that it is

¹³ This is given under the word *rather*. Like Dr. Johnson, the editors above quoted wax in assurance as they advance in the alphabet. For, under *have*, they write: "Had rather, had as lief, had better, are, probably, formed by corruption, for *would rather*, etc., when contracted; as, *I'd rather*." And compare what they say under *lief*.

¹⁴ *Fragments of Two Essays in English Philology* (1873), Part II, p. 71.

¹⁵ *Ibid.* Part II, p. 68. Archdeacon Hare evidently suspected an ellipsis of *to*, before the verb, in "I had rather do," but, strangely enough, was unable to produce any old passage in substantiation of his surmise. And there he stopped. To ponder *had* and *rather*, in "I had rather do," does not seem to have occurred to him.

Landor, who entertained a particular dislike to *had rather* and *had better*, speaks of one or other of them no fewer than five times. See his *Life and Works* (1876), vol. IV, pp. 62, 170, 184, 210, 249. He is positive that *had* there originated from an ignorant expansion of *I'd* or *I'on'd*, contracted from *I would*. Nor is he satisfied with thus much of common-place. After the fashion of many others, he strikes out the middle word from *had rather be*, and asks: "Cannot our writers perceive that *had be* is not English?" Archdeacon Hare has since likewise written: "Leave out the adverb, and no one would take 'I had do,' 'you had go,' to be English; and the go-between can hardly be said to legalize the union" seen in "'I had rather do,' 'you had better go.'" *Fragments*, etc. (*ut supra*), Part II, p. 68.

In his fastidiousness, Landor prefers, to the usual phraseology: "You would better let that chap alone." Vol. VI, p. 124. Worse still, he has: "Those who removed it, in this instance, were little aware that they had better left it." Vol. IV, p. 229. On the same model would be "He had better gone home." Why, since he shrank from *had better have left*, did not Landor put *would better have left*, instead of trespassing into the diction of poetry?



genuine English. It is difficult, however, nay, perhaps impossible, to reconcile it to analogy. Were I to offer conjecture on the subject, I should be inclined to say, that, in such phrases as '*I had go*,' '*I had*' is, by a grammatical figure very common in English, put for '*I would have*' or '*I would possess*,' and that the simple name of the act or state, by an ellipsis perhaps of the verbal sign, is subjoined, as the object wished, no regard being had to the completion of the action; in the same manner as we say '*I would have gone*,' when we wish the action perfected."¹⁶

That Dr. Crombie credits "some of our earliest writers" with "*I had rather go*," evinces how little he was conversant with them.¹⁷ How, too, can he be "tempted to infer that it is genuine English," seeing that he expressly classes it among phrases which "include a solecism"? By "solecism," it should be noted, he understands "construction contrary to the English idiom"; and, in the page next after that where this definition occurs, it is laid down that a solecism is "an offence against the rules of syntax," strangely exemplified by the word *peoples*, and by *attendance* in the sense of "attention." But this only in passing.

Our ancestors must have been, forsooth, a most peculiar people, if, agreeably to Dr. Crombie's extraordinary theory, they chose to frame, in their minds, so mysterious an idea, to denote a conditional wish to go, as that expressed by "*I would possess going*"; modified it, in speech, into "*I had go*"; and then slipped in *rather*, to the generation of "*I had rather go*".¹⁸

¹⁶ *A Treatise on the Etymology and Syntax of the English Language* (ed. 1809), pp. 328-330.

¹⁷ The Rev. Dr. E. A. Abbott says, in his *Shakespearian Grammar* (ed. 1871), p. 152: "In Chaucer and earlier writers, preference is expressed both by our modern '*I had, or would, rather* (*i. e.*, sooner)'," etc. Not to be misunderstood, this needs qualifying. Chaucer may, possibly, have written "*I would rather go*" and "*I had rather gone*"; but he surely cannot be quoted for "our modern" "*I had rather go*," or the like.

¹⁸ The Rev. Dr. Philip Withers defended *had rather*, as in "*I had rather go*," after a fashion of his own. Supposing an ellipsis, after it, of *to*, he maintains that its *had*, which he still holds to be an auxiliary verb, is "legitimately construed [sic] with an infinitive active." In the course of his tedious folly, he writes:

"Luther *had to oppose* prejudices, *rather than to confute* arguments."

"Luther *had rather to oppose* prejudices, *than to confute* arguments."

"*I had rather oppose* prejudices, *than to contend against* facts."

"The first and second instances refer to a specified time. The last instance is the past indefinite." *Aristarchus* (1791), p. 197 (ed. 1822).

Besides *rather*, we find, without necessarily recurring to antiquated literature, *better*, *best*, *need*, *as good*, *as lief*,¹⁹ *liefer*, and so on, in constructions popularly supposed to be, one and all, parallel to that of the passage from the *Psalms*, adverted to in my opening paragraph.

From the Anglo-Saxon adjective *leōf* we formerly had *lef*,²⁰ "beloved," "dear," "precious," "acceptable," "wished for,"

His third sentence, not to speak of its omission of *to*, drops the idea of obligation implied by the unauxiliary *had* of the two first sentences, and retains from them only the idea of preference. The distinction of tenses which he points to is nothing to his immediate purpose. Though not himself obtuse, he must have expected his readers to be so, if to be imposed on by such transparent sophistry.

¹⁹ Old spellings of our present *lief* are *leof*, *lef*, *lefe*, *leff*, *leffe*, *leef*, *leefe*, *leeff*, *leyf*, *leyff*, *leyfe*, *leif*, *leife*, *leiffe*, *lyf*, *lyff*, *lyef*, *lyefe*, *liefe*, *life*, *liffe*, *leaf*, *leove*, *leve*, *leeve*, *leive*, *leave*, *lieve*, *lyve*, *live*, *luef*, *leife* (for rime). Add *liefs*, *lieves*, and *lives*, American, for the most part; with *looze* and *luze*, which I have heard in East Anglia.

Among the predecessors of *liefer* which occur are, in addition to *leever*, which is much the commonest, *leovere*, *levere*, *leveer*, *levre*, *levyr*, *lewyr*, *levir*, *leiver*, *leaver*, *liever*, *lyver*, *luere*, *lefir*, *leefir*, *leferre*, *leifer*, *leiffer*, *leyffer*, *lieffer*.

The superlative was written *leovest*, *levest*, *leveste*, *leofest*, *leofeste*, *liefest*.

Of course there are more varieties; but these are all that I find in the thousand and more extracts which I have made for *lief* and its conjugates.

The special Scotch forms I have made no attempt to collect.

²⁰ This is very common in old authors, qualifying *lord*, *master*, *sir*, *leman*, *dame*, *child*, *fere*, *life*, and so forth. Till past the middle of the sixteenth century, it was frequently coupled with *dear*, as in Mr. Tennyson's attempted revival of the term. See the anonymous *Kyng Alisaunder* (about 1300?), ll. 776, 2496: Robert Mannyng (1327-1338), in Hearne's *Peter Langtoft's Chronicle* (ed. 1810), pp. 44, 197: *Chester Plays* (about 1328?), vol. I, pp. 28, 77, 169, 196; vol. II, pp. 116, 128: Richard Rolle de Hampole, *Prick of Conscience* (ab. 1340), l. 2978: Chaucer, *Poetical Works* (Mr. Bell's ed., which I uniformly refer to), vol. I, p. 204; *id.*, *Boethius*, p. 37: Gower, *Confessio Amantis* (ed. Dr. Pauli, which I always quote), vol. III, p. 108: Hoccleve (1406?), *Poems* (ed. 1796), p. 47: *Townley Mysteries* (*temp. Hen. VI?*), pp. 123, 323.

The work last named also has, at p. 236: "And ther is nothing me so *lef* As murder a mycher and hang a thefe."

"In to *lef* reste his sowle wond." *Story of Genesis and Exodus* (about 1250), l. 4136. In l. 340, "lef or loth" means "pleasing or displeasing"; as also in Gower, *Conf. Amant.*, vol. I, p. 268, etc., etc.

"And that is to me bothe gladde and *lef*." Syr Tryamoure (*temp. Ed. II?*) in Utterson's *Select Pieces of Early Popular Poetry*, vol. I, p. 10.

In the *Ludus Coventriae* (15th cent.?), p. 396, we read: "To hurle wyth the harlotys me is ful *lef*."

"agreeable," "pleasant," and so forth,—with its comparative and superlative, *lever* and *levest*.²¹ Soon after the beginning of the

Lief was also a substantive, denoting "friend," "lover," etc. See *Kyng Ali-saunder* (*ut sup.*), l. 2906: Chaucer, *Poetical Works*, vol. III, p. 217: Gower, *Conf. Amant.*, vol. I, pp. 243, 343. "Noither *lefe* no lothe northern . . . spared *lefe* no loth." Robert Mannyng (*ut sup.*), p. 75. And see pp. 113, 131, 134, 215, 220, 286. "Nether for *leiffe* nor for loth." *Chester Plays* (*ut sup.*), vol. I, p. 92. "For *lief* ne loth." Chaucer, *Poetical Works*, vol. III, p. 96. "Youre *leyfes* and your females." *Townley Mysteries* (*ut sup.*), p. 320. See also *Religious Pieces in Prose and Verse* (14th century?), p. 53 (1867): *Amis and Amiloun* (15th century?), l. 87: *Lyfe of Ipomydon* (15th century?), l. 2294: *Merlin* (1450-1460?), p. 693. Gower and Spenser, too, with many others, might here be quoted.

Unlief, "unbeloved," "disagreeable," is found in Lydgate, *The Tragedies*, etc. (Wayland's undated edition), fol. 2 v.; and in the *Chester Plays* (*ut sup.*), vol. I, p. 42.

Leman or *leman*, "lover," "sweetheart," of old written *leofmon*, *leovemon*, *lefmon*, and *leveman*, was long ago shown to be *lief man*.

In the *Chester Plays* (*ut sup.*), vol. I, p. 169, is "gotten by *leffe* of kinde," in other words, "by natural love." Compare together the Anglo-Saxon for *love* and *lief*, namely, *lufe* and *leff*.

"*Lefe-long*," qualifying *day*, for which see Mr. Halliwell's *Illustrations*, etc. (1845), and his *Dictionary*, is, apparently, for *lefe long*. Is it the same as our *live-long*? And did this originate as two words, *lief long*; the *lief* being ironical, like *precious*, in "precious fool"?

Liefsome is used by the Earl of Surrey. See Dr. Richardson's *Dictionary*. Its predecessor, *liefly*, occurs in *Early English Alliterative Poems* (15th cent.), p. 67; and in Thomas Chestre's *Romance of Launfal*, in Mr. Halliwell's *Illustrations*, etc. (*ut sup.*), p. 28. For *lefful*, "dear," "precious," see *Story of Genesis and Exodus* (*ut sup.*), ll. 155, 2524.

²¹ "Androgeus him was *leovere*." Layamon, *Brut* (not long after 1204), vol. I, p. 306.

"*Levere* him were with his kinne." *Floriz and Blauncheflur* (about 1280), l. 806, in *King Horn*, etc. (1866).

"It were me *lever* than twenty pound worth lond," etc. Chaucer, *Poetical Works*, vol. II, p. 224. And see vol. III, p. 143.

"Him was *levere* his oghne [*i. e.*, own] deth desire." Gower, in *Political Poems and Songs*, vol. II, p. 14. "Now chese and take whiche you is *lever*." *Id.*, *Conf. Amant.*, vol. II, p. 205. See also vol. III, p. 281, etc., etc.

"So, withoute your better avyse, I and my brothyrr purpose us to be with you ther at that tyme; for, the sonner, the *levyr* me." John Clopton (about 1454), in the *Paston Letters*, vol. I, pp. 284, 285. For the equipollent "the rather, the *levere*," see John Shillingford (1447), in *Letters and Papers* (Camden Society), p. 24. Note the similarity, here, to the German "je eher je lieber"; and compare "so lengre so *leovere*," in *Seinte Marherete*, p. 2.

"I have but on [*i. e.*, one] gowne at Framyngham, and an other here; and that is my *levere* gowne," etc. John Paston, Jr. (1462), in the *Paston Letters*, vol. II, p. 120.

seventeenth century, these words became, however, save in phrases, virtually extinct; no one then any longer venturing them, except Philemon Holland²² and a few others, who affected the diction of a bygone age.

"My lord, Syr Gareth, is to me more *lever* to have and welde as my husband, than ony kyng or prynce that is crystned." Sir Thomas Malory, *La Mort Darthur* (1469), vol. I, p. 242 (Southey's edition).

"That were me *lever*, sayd dame Elayne, than alle the gold that is above the erthe." *Id., ibid.*, vol. II, p. 168.

Many more quotations in point will be seen in subsequent notes.

"A mon that were the *lewest*," etc. *Ancren Riwle* (13th century), p. 244.

"As *lewest* him thought;" "The *lewest* thing for thy luf." *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight* (about 1320-1330), ll. 49, 1802 (ed. 1864).

"What signe is the *lewest* to have . . . ?" *William of Palerne* (about 1350), l. 3213 (ed. 1867).

"Love is the *leveste* thinge that our Lord askith." William Langland, *Vision of Piers Plowman* (1362), Passus I, l. 180 (ed. 1867).

"Thre pointes, which, I finde, Ben *lewest* unto," etc. Gower, *Conf. Amant.*, vol. II, p. 133.

"Yf that ye lyst to wedde her your self, that is me *lewest*." Sir Thomas Malory (*ut sup.*), vol. I, p. 282.

"God knowyth myn entent, Whom I besech to send yowr *lewest* herts desyr." Sir Thomas Brews (1477), in the *Paston Letters*, vol. III, p. 177. "Your *lewest* desyers." Margaret Paston (1477), *ibid.*, vol. III, p. 194.

But like references need not be multiplied.

Perplexed by "ye best and *leuwest* hors of al ye host," in Lord Berners's *Frois sart* (1523-1525), vol. I, p. 12 (ed. 1812), I turned to the French, which has "le plus petit, maigre, et chétif cheval qu'il put trouver." The horse was, then, "the least and *leanest*."

Sir John Paston wrote, in 1474, instead of *lewest*, *leswest*, as though he thought he was having to do with a French word. See the *Paston Letters*, vol. III, p. 120.

²² "My *leefe* and onely sonne" occurs in his *Cyrupaedia* (1632), p. 101: and see pp. 108, 207. See, further, his *Ammianus Marcellinus* (1609), pp. 147, 390. Holland was born in 1551, and died in 1636.

Mr. T. L. Kington Oliphant, in his *Sources of Standard English*, p. 286, names the adjective *lief* among "old Teutonic words, now obsolete, . . . which Tyndale unhappily did not employ in his great work [he did, however, if *lief* includes *liefer*], though they must have been household words in his childhood." Tyndale was born about 1477; and not only in his youth was *lief* rife, but to the end of his days, and long after. "To no man so *liefe*." Sir Thomas More, *Historie of King Richard the Thirde* (about 1513), p. 68 (ed. 1821). In the translation of Polydore Vergil, of the time of Henry VIII, published by the Camden Society in 1846, "leefe unto himme," etc., will be found at pp. 46, 81, 172, 294. For *liefer*, "dearer," etc., I might quote Alexander Barclay, George Ferrars, and Holinshed. Tyndale, too, has it, in his *New Testament*, 1 *Corinthians*, xiv, 19.

In "him was lever have . . . Twenty bookes,"²³ and the like,²⁴ we see specimens of the most ancient English forerunners of the group of phrases under consideration. The import of the quotation

As late as near the close of the seventeenth century, *lief*, "carus," was treated by lexicographers as if still popularly intelligible; witness William Robertson's *Phraseologia Generalis* (1681), and Adam Littleton's *Latine Dictionary* (1684).

That Shakespeare had any hand in the *Second Part of King Henry VI*, is doubted by many; and the fact that the expressions "mine alderliest sovereign" and "my liefest liege" are found there, has some weight towards disposing one to abjudicate it from it. Though Shakespeare, in dramas unquestionably his, again and again uses "as *lief*," he does not use *lief* otherwise, and also avoids its comparative and superlative; and the quaint *alderliest* is far from being after his manner. What is still more significant, the passages of the *Second Part*, etc., which contain *alderliest* and *liefest* are not in the old play of 1594, on which it is founded. Was there another form of the old play than that which we possess,—one giving those passages,—which has not come down to us? Robert Greene, among Shakespeare's early contemporaries, has the adjectives *lief*, *liefer*, *alderliest*, and *aldertruest*. Can it be that Greene contributed to the *Second Part*, etc., in some form of it which is not known to have survived, and that the *alderliest* and *liefest* spoken of above are from his pen? I might say more; but this is not the place to say it.

²³ Chaucer, *Poetical Works*, vol. I, p. 90. See also vol. II, p. 224; vol. III, p. 237.

²⁴ "Leovere heom his to libben," i. e., "to live is, to them, more desirable." Layamon, *Brut* (*ut sup.*), vol. I, p. 20.

"Me wore levere, quad Ioseph, Of eddi dremes rechen swep." *Story of Genesis and Exodus* (*ut sup.*), ll. 2085, 2086.

"Me were leovere vorto don me toward Rome." *Ancren Riwle* (*ut sup.*), p. 430. "Levere was him to be forsworen." Anon., *Havelok the Dane* (about 1280), l. 1423 (ed. 1868). "Me wore levere I wore lame." *Ibid.*, l. 1938. And see ll. 1193, 1671.

"Ac monnis flesch lever him was Than ony corn that ony mon has." *Kyng Alisaunder* (*ut sup.*), ll. 694, 695.

"Him were levere meten one hen Then half an oundred wimmen." Anon. (from a MS. temp. Ed. I), in *Reliquiae Antiquae*, vol. II, p. 272.

"Me wor lever to be dedh." Anon. (early in the 14th century), *ibid.*, vol. I, p. 146.

"Me were levere be ded." Anon., *Maximon* (in or before temp. Ed. II), *ibid.*, vol. I, p. 121.

"For lever me is this lif to have," "lever me hade have woned in wildernessee." *William of Palerne* (*ut sup.*), ll. 3098, 3308. And see ll. 855, 994, 2022.

"Yit war me lever that thai so ware." Anon., *The Seven Sages* (14th century?), l. 2843.

"For hym was levere stèle upon hem than come upon hem with a bataile opounliche." John of Trevisa (1387), in *Higden's Polychronicon* (ed. 1865, etc.), vol. II, p. 395.

is: " *To have twenty books was more acceptable to him.*" The idiom is substantially Anglo-Saxon;²⁵ and the pronoun which it exhibits is in the dative case.

" *For me were lever to lacke breth Than speken of her name amis.*" Gower, *Conf. Amant.*, vol. I, p. 177. See also vol. I, pp. 270, 305, 329, etc., etc.

" *Me ware lever say fyve wordes in herte devoutly, thane fyve thousande with my mouthe withowttene lykyng.*" *Religious Pieces in Prose and Verse (ut sup.)*, p. 38. See *1 Corinthians*, xiv, 19.

" *Me ware lever prevely be prykkyd to the harte.*" Anon., *Morte Arthure* (14th century?), l. 2649 (1865).

" *Him was lever to ryn than ryde.*" Anon., *Syr Gowgther* (15th century), in *Utterson's Select Pieces*, etc. (*ut sup.*), vol. I, p. 171.

" *Hem is lever Lete make her hyves,*" etc. Anon., *Palladius on Husbondrie* (about 1420?), p. 38 (1873).

" *Nay, for hym were lever to have his tonge drawen oute.*" *Merlin* (*ut sup.*), p. 302.

" *It were me lever, sayd the quene, to dye in the water, than to falle in your enemyes handes, and there be slayne.*" Sir Thomas Malory (*ut sup.*), vol. I, p. 93.

" *Them wer lever to leese all that thei have besyde, then to have suche a vilany done them.*" Sir Thomas More, *Historie*, etc. (about 1513, *ut sup.*) p. 109.

" *And, tharefore, if thou be putt fra thi reste by devocyone, whene the ware leveste be stille tharat, by thy childire, thy servantes,*" etc. Richard Rolle de Hampole (died 1349), *English Prose Treatises* (1866), p. 30.

" *And elles may she nought fulfille What thinge her were levest have.*" Gower, *Conf. Amant.*, vol. I, p. 96: and see vol. I, p. 170; vol. II, p. 52. Also *id.* in *Political Poems and Songs*, vol. II, p. 5.

" *Therfor lerne the byleve levest me were.*" Anon., *Pierce the Ploughmans Cred* (about 1394), l. 16.

" *Thai may have redy passage owt of oure land, from what port thai come too unto what port thayme is levest to drawe to by youre advis.*" King Henry V (1417), in Sir Henry Ellis's *Original Letters*, etc., Third Series (1846), vol. I, p. 63.

" *Arthur sone hathe take the land That hym was leveste in to lende.*" Anon., *Le Morte Arthur* (before 1460?), ll. 3058, 3059 (1864).

Compare the German, as in: " *Ist es Euch lieber, so nehmt die Kerze.*"

" *Be ðæm is awritten ðæt betra bio se geðyldega wer ðonne se gilpna, forðæmpe him bið liofre scande to ðolianne ðonne ðæt god to cyðanne ðæt he digollice deð, ðylæs he for ðæm undeawe ðæs gilpes hit forleose. Ac ðæm gilpnan bið liofre ðæt he sege on hiene selfne, gif he hwæt godes wat, ge ðeah he nyte hwæt he soðes secge, him is ðeah leofre ðæt he leoge ðonne him mon ænigra ungerisna to wene.*" *King Alfred's West-Saxon Version of Gregory's Pastoral Care* (edited by Mr. Henry Sweet), p. 216.

Mr. Sweet has obligingly communicated to me the following extract from an Anglo-Saxon will, in which a man says of his wife: " *Gif hire liofre sie on mynster to gangenne,*" or, " *if it be more agreeable to her to go into a convent.*"

To the first half of the fourteenth century, perhaps, belongs the origin of expressions like "I have lever it layne,"²⁶ or "to conceal it I regard as preferable"; and "As she was esheked [i. e., asked] of him, whether sheo hadde lyver have him than his sone that stode ther by, into housbond, sheo chees his sone."²⁷ Of very

²⁶ *William of Palerne (ut sup.)*, l. 918. And see l. 546. As to "I have lever," for "I have it lever," it is similarly omitted in our "think best, better, fit, good," in the old "think long," and in "make sure," "take upon," etc., etc.

Hearne (*ut sup.*) quotes, at p. excvii, the following anonymous passage, which he doubtfully assigns to the year 1310: "I have lever that thou do me to dethe then defowle my body."

"Yet have I lever leese My lif"; "Yit hath this brid . . . Lever to be in forest," etc. Chaucer, *Poetical Works*, vol. II, p. 248; vol. III, p. 242.

"This knight hath lever for to die," etc. Gower, *Conf. Amant.*, vol I, p. 93.

"And, by my trouthe, I have wel lever No more kyn than my a b c." From some verses probably written about 1418, in *Political Poems and Songs (ut sup.)*, vol. II, p. 243.

"Sith lever I have with some edge tolle To slee my selfe, than lyve in slander and dole." Lydgate, *Trag. dies*, etc. (*ut sup.*) fol. 44 v. and 45 r.

"Lever I have my life now to lose, Rather than soyle my wydowes chastitie." *Id., ibid.*, fol. 49 v. Even Hallam uses *rather*, as here, superfluously: "But those who had introduced the bill very wisely thought it better to sacrifice a point of dignity, *rather* than lose so important a statute." *Constitutional History* (ed. 1842), vol. II, p. 206, foot-note.

"I have lever to be deed than to be cristin." *Merlin (ut sup.)*, p. 592. See also p. 241.

"And y have leefir forto seie sumwhat of the trewe substancial answers longing therto," etc. Bp. Reginald Pecock, *Repressor*, etc. (about 1456), p. 78. See also pp. 85, 91.

Between 1456 and 1464, the Rev. Thomas Howes and Sir Robert Williamson wrote, respectively, "I have lever other men go" and "I have levir to go." *Paston Letters*, vol. I, p. 407, and vol. II, p. 81.

"For I have lever dye with worship than lyve with shame." Sir Thomas Malory (*ut sup.*), vol. I, p. 280. And see vol. II, p. 275.

"Rather than it shold be done, I have lever to quytte yow, and gyve yow my parte, soo that his lyf may be saved." Caxton (1483), in the *Knight of La Tour-Landry* (ed. 1868), p. 101.

"For I have levyr abyde respyt," etc. *Ludus Coventriae (ut sup.)*, p. 121.

²⁷ From the anonymous prose addition to Robert of Gloucester's *Chronicle*, quoted by Hearne (*ut sup.*), p. 12.

"Theo riche . . . saide they hadden, sikirliche, Leovere steorve," etc. *Kyng Alisaunder (ut sup.)*, ll. 1232-1234.

"They hadde lever to don soo," etc. Anon., *Richard Coer de Lion (temp. Ed. I?)*, l. 6105.

"Tryamoure swore by Goddes myghte, I had lever it had on the lyghte." *Syr Tryamoure*, in Utterson's *Select Pieces*, etc. (*ut sup.*), vol I, p. 56.

much less common occurrence is the superlative *liefest* similarly collocated, as in the sentence: "For, yf I shold speke of all, I shold never make an ende. So saye me, thenne, wheroft thou hast lievest for to here."²⁸ *Have* and *had*, in these passages, are

"Otherhuil hy byeth ynogh awaked to nyedes that hi *hadden levere lyse* your messen thanne ane zout other ane slep." Dan Michel, *Ayenbite of Invyle* (1340, in the Kentish dialect), p. 31.

"At grete festes, and for straungeres, thei setten formes and tables, as men don in this contree; but thei *had lever sytten* in the erthe." Sir John Maundevile, *Voyage and Travaile*, etc. (1356), p. 29 (ed. 1839).

"For alse moche as many men ne may not suffre the savour of the see, but *hadden lever to gon by londe*," etc. *Id., ibid.*, p. 126.

"I *had lever go to Rome*." *Townley Mysteries* (*ut sup.*), p. 308.

"*Lever ich had to dyen*." Chaucer, *Poetical Works*, vol. II, p. 191.

"I *hadde lever to be lewed*," etc. Gower, *Conf. Amant.*, vol. I, p. 295. See also vol. I, pp. 212, 240, etc.

"He wolde hurte ne greve no body, but *hadde lever to selle* his wyves golden vessell," etc. Anon., *Cronycle of Englonde* (1483), sig. F 3 v. (ed. 1510). And see sig. I 3 v., I 4 r., K 3 r., R 5 v.

"I *had lever thus homely for to dine*." Rev. Alexander Barclay, *Mirroure of Good Maners* (about 1523), sig. D 3 r. (ed. 1570).

"He woulde not breake hys pennance; he *had lever dye*." Anon., *Lyfe of Roberte the Devyll*, l. 1072, in Mr. W. C. Hazlitt's *Remains*, etc., vol. I, p. 260. *Had* is here a preterite.

"*Lever he hadde for to be deed than langour in soche maner*." *Merlin* (*ut sup.*), p. 540. Here, too, *had* is a preterite.

Of what is about to be asserted the proofs have been supplied by a careful scrutiny of scores of old books and modern, and by a collection of several hundred pertinent quotations which this scrutiny has yielded.

From about 1450, *had liefer* enjoyed great vogue for a century or so, and then gradually declined in popularity. It is noticeable, that, in the reprint of Tyndale's works which was published in 1573, either Day or Fox twice altered the reformer's *had liefer* into *had rather*. *Merlin*, Sir Thomas Malory, and Lord Berners are studded with *had liefer*; and the expression was a favourite with Alexander Barclay, Sir Thomas More, Tyndale, and Sir Thomas Elyot. After 1600, or thereabouts, few except archaic or otherwise peculiar stylists, such as Philemon Holland, are found to employ it. At no time since its introduction can it, as a provincialism, or colloquialism, have been in abeyance. Since the year 1800, it has been practically accepted by Southey and the Rev. H. F. Cary; and Mr. Charles Reade uses it repeatedly. Nay, we read, in the pages of a very elegant living writer: "And yet *had men liefer* by knowledge never *find* that which they seek, than by love possess that thing which, also, without love, were in vain found." Mr. Walter H. Pater, *Studies in the History of the Renaissance* (1873), p. 32.

²⁸ Lydgate (?), *The Booke of the Pylgremage of the Sowle* (1413), p. 75 (ed. 1859).

"Yef he lyve longe, he shall be the beste knyght that ever was, and that I *hadde levest to resemble*." *Merlin* (*ut sup.*), p. 456.

not auxiliaries, just as they are not in the passages here ensuing:

"So gret liking and love I have that lud to bihold,
That I have lever that love than lac al mi harmes."²⁹

"Notheles, ful feole and fille
Beoth yfounde, in heorte and wille,
That *hadde levere* a ribaudye
Than to here of God other of Seynte Marie."³⁰

"For he *had had lever* than all the good of the world, he myghte have ben revenged upon Sir Mellyagraunce."³¹

"Having *leifer* to committ their cause to open disputing, then to seeme, to the people whom they had subverted, to have nothing to say," etc.³²

Had had, in the third of these extracts, is to be inter-

"Of alle knyghtes that ben on lyve, excepte thre, I *had levest have yow*." Sir Thomas Malory (*ut sup.*), vol. II, p. 109.

"Yet *had I most liefest to yield* and confess the matter," etc. George Cavendish, *Life of Cardinal Wolsey* (about 1560), vol. I, p. 249 (Mr. Singer's ed.).

²⁹ *William of Palerne* (*ut sup.*), ll. 452, 453. The sense is: "So great pleasure and love have I in beholding that man, that I reckon that love of more account than the being free from all my sorrows."

"If the place that is beside Walsyngham stand cler, I *have hit lever* then the tother." Sir John Fastolf (1449?), in the *Paston Letters*, vol. I, p. 94.

³⁰ *Kyng Alisaunder* (*ut sup.*), ll. 19-22.

"I *hadde lever* than my schert," etc. Chaucer, *Poetical Works*, vol. III, p. 224.

"I *had her lever* than a mine Of gold," etc. Gower, *Conf. Amant.*, vol. II, p. 130.

"I *had lever* thene alle Fraunce . . . Fyghte with the," etc. *Morte Arthure* (*ut sup.*), ll. 1344, 1345. See also ll. 872, 4160.

"For the saule *had lever*, that in payn dueles, A day of pardon than anythyng elles." Richard Rolle de Hampole, *Prick of Conscience* (*ut sup.*), ll. 3936, 3937.

"I *had hym lever* than othyr fyve; For he was stronge in stowre." Anon., *Sir Cleges* (14th century?), ll. 491, 492.

"I *had lever* than al the gold betwixe this and Rome, I had ben there." Sir Thomas Malory (*ut sup.*), vol. II, p. 100. See also vol. I, pp. 90, 138, 141, 281; vol. II, pp. 368, 394.

Like expressions are used by Margaret Paston (1450), the Rev. Thomas Howes (1454), Richard Calle (1469), and Sir John Paston (1470, 1477, 1486), in the *Paston Letters*, vol. I, pp. 111, 307; vol. II, pp. 351, 416; vol. III, pp. 190, 338.

³¹ Sir Thomas Malory (*ut sup.*), vol. II, p. 379.

³² Rev. Dr. Thomas Stapleton, *The History of the Church of Englande* (1565), fol. 25. Dr. Thomas Fuller, where he quotes the passage recited in the text, very gratuitously surmises, in "having rather," some error of the press.

preted by "would have deemed,"³³ *Have, had, and having*, in the other extracts, are one with "deem," "should deem," and "deeming," respectively.

Have, the neuter verb, meaning "be obliged," takes an infinitive. But very different is the nature of *have*, etc., in the passages cited above and in subjoined notes. The occasional presence, after those words, of *to*,³⁴ and also of the objective case, shows, at the same time, as I have already said, that they are not there auxiliaries.

³³ "But thei lefte fulle of hir owen reste in comtemplacion, when thei *had* welle *lever have* ben stille, that, for love of hir even cristene, thei intermettid hem with worldely besynes, in helpyng of hir sugettis; and, sothly, that was charite." Richard Rolle de Hampole, *English Prose Treatises* (*ut sup.*), p. 25. The writer meant "*had had welle lever be*."

"Ich *had lever*, til domesday, *Have lived in care and wo*." Anon., *Amis and Amiloun* (15th century?), ll. 2321, 2322. Correct to "*had had lever . . . live*."

"Thou seiste trewe; for *hadde lever a be* in grete aventure than thou sholdest dye." *Merlin* (*ut sup.*), p. 35. Here, besides ellipsis, there is the same fault as above.

Tyndale writes: "Lucretia *had lever have been* slain, if he had not been too strong for her, than to have lost her glory." *Doctrinal Treatises*, etc. (1848), p. 185. He ought to have put *had had lever be slain*. Note, too, the illogical double preterite. This error, which many persons still fall into, was ancient even in Tyndale's day.

In *Merlin* (*ut sup.*), p. 468, we read: "I *hadde lever* she *hadde be* biried all quyk, than this *hadde* hir befallen." Here there is much freedom of ellipsis.

"That, I kno well, the kyngis grace *hade lever hade* be done." etc. John Flamank (1503?), in *Letters and Papers Illustrative of the Reigns of Richard III and Henry VII*, vol. I, p. 232. The second *had*, in this extract, is an example of the past-participial infinitive. It is here cut down from *have had*.

³⁴ As *to*, after *bid, dare, feel, help, make, need*, etc., may now sometimes be dispensed with, so it was, of old, occasionally dispensed with after, for instance, *advise, begin, behove, beseech, chance, charge, command, constrain, dare (defy), desire, endeavour, enforce, enjoin, forbid, force, forget, grant, intend, know, license, move, observe, ought, permit, persuade, seem, suffer, suppose, teach, think, use, vouchsafe, will (wish), wish*. To the same category belongs *cause*, the *to* after which is still dropped by many Scotchmen. Add *can* (be able), *do* (cause), *learn* (teach), *leave, like (please), hast (wish), mow (be able); and likewise beteem, fortune, gin, list, rede, ween, wit, wone*.

Contrariwise, *to* was once often put after *hear, let, see*, etc., as might be proved out of the *Paston Letters*, Lord Berners, Sir Thomas Hoby, Dr. Henry More, etc., etc.

As well as after many verbs, an ellipsis of *to* was formerly allowed after certain adjectives, in phrases. *To* is dropped, after *allowable*, by Bp. Pecock; after *better*, by Lydgate, Alexander Barclay, Sir Thomas Wilson, Lord Herbert, etc.; after *free*, by Gower; after *lawful, profitable, and speedful*, by Bp. Pecock; after *wholesome*, by Hoccleve; after *wont*, by Bp. Pecock and Abp. Warham; after *worthy*, by Bp. Pecock and Alexander Barclay.

The infinitive, as *to die*, instead of *dying*, after *had liefer*, etc., is nothing strange, as an old idiom,³⁵ if we bear in mind the sense of the words preceding it. "I think to die more desirable," which is still tolerated, was once a current mode of expressing "I think dying more desirable," or "I think it more desirable to die."

Even as late as Queen Elizabeth's time, the infinitive accompanied by its sign being still sometimes put after *had liefer*, it was distinctly recognized that *had* is there a notional verb; and, as the context forbids the idea that it imports obligation, it must have been felt that *liefer* is an adjective. Thus: "The poete *had lieffer to halte* in his life then in his verse."³⁶

Like *εχειν*, *habere*, *avere*, *haber*, *avoir*, *haben*, our *have*, in the natural course of development, came to signify "deem," "hold,"

Hence, there is nothing that is not normal enough about *had liefer die*, instead of *had liefer to die*.

³⁵ "We wold do thus myche, as for *to put* the coort in contenuans." John Paston (1465), in the *Paston Letters*, vol. II, p. 246.

"As for *to kysse* yow, said Sir Launcelot, I maye doo that and lese no worshyp." Sir Thomas Malory (*ut sup.*), vol. II, p. 377. See also vol. I, p. 170; vol. II, pp. 88, 199, 413.

"The grete lordes of Englonde were ayenst *to conferme* the peas and the trewes above sayd." Anon., *Cronycle of Englonde* (1483, *ut sup.*), sig. T 4 r.

"But, trust me, Coridon, there is diversitie Betwene *to have* riches, and riches to have thee." Rev. Alexander Barclay, *Egloges* (about 1520), sig. A 5 v. (ed. 1570).

"As touchyng *to gyve* them saveconduct," etc.; "As to *retourne* all the landes agayne," etc. Lord Berners, *Froissart* (1523-1525), vol. I, p. 757; vol. II, p. 599 (ed. 1812). "Without *to wyll*," etc. *Id.*, *The Golden Boke*, etc. (1534), sig. Mm 7 r. (ed. 1546).

"As touching *to please* God," etc.; "Then was Christ to blame for *to say*, that," etc. Tyndale (1532), *Expositions*, etc. (1849), pp. 102, 121.

"For, as for [*sic*] accuse folke openly for heresye," etc. Sir Thomas More, *Apologye* (1533), fol. 226 v.

"And shee putteth in hazarde *to staine* the renowme of honestie." Sir Thomas Hoby, *The Courtyer* (1561), sig Q 7 v. (ed. 1577).

"As to *come* to him, he was not then so determined." Richard Grafton, *Chronicle* (1569), vol. II, p. 156 (ed. 1809).

"After he had done . . . *to rave*," etc. Anon., *New Custome* (1573), Act I, Scene II.

"They thought the same difference to bee . . . that is betwixt *to sin* and not to sinne." Anthony Stafford, *Niobe* (1611), pp. 75, 76.

³⁶ James Sanford, Translation of Agrippa (1569), fol. 179 v. See also fol. 104 v. and 106 v.; and the extract lately made from Stapleton.

For earlier instances, see Tyndale, *Doctrinal Treatises*, etc. (*ut sup.*), p. 393; *Expositions*, etc. (*ut sup.*), pp. 22, 306.

"regard," "consider," "account," "rate";³⁷ that is to say, originally denoting possession, it grew to be factitive.

³⁷ King Alfred (*ut sup.*), p. 134, writes: "He wilniað ðæt hie mon *hæbbe* for ða betstan and ða halgestan."

"The Chane and alle the men of Tartarye *han* the nombre of 9 in gret reverence." Sir John Maundevile (*ut sup.*), p. 228.

"But men *han* hem suspect of eresie for many causis." Wicliffe, *Three Treatises* (1851), p. 43. And see p. 44.

"Ye schul also *have* in suspect the counsel of such folk," etc. Chaucer, *Poetical Works*, vol. III, p. 146. See also vol. III, p. 152.

"Trusty and welbeloved, I greet you wel; praying you that you wil *have* in tendernes and favor my welbeloved cousin," etc. John, Lord Scrope (1432), in the *Plumpton Correspondence* (Camden Society), Historical Notices, p. xxxvi.

"*Hadde* in favor." Clement Paston (1461), in the *Paston Letters*, vol. II, p. 43. In the next page, John, Lord Beauchamp (1461) uses the same expression.

"That cyte was never *hadde* in worshyppe." Anon., *Cronycle of Englonde* (1483, *ut sup.*), sig. A 4 r. "But, with an hevy hoste, he torned ayen, and was *hadde* worthy to suffre, for [i. e., for all] his ryghtwysenes." *Id., ibid.*, fol. 2 r. of an arbitrary signature between Z and Aa.

"Men *had* it ever inwardely suspect." Sir Thomas More, *Historie*, etc. (about 1513, *ut sup.*), p. 126.

"Farthermore, wepyng, he besought and required hym, for all amyte and love whiche had ben bytwene them, and for all the faythfull service which he had done to hym in foretyme, nat to *have* hym suspected in so cruell a dede." Rev. Alexander Barclay, Translation of Sallust (Pynson's second ed.), fol. 55 v. "Nat to *have*," etc., represents "ne . . . suspectum se *haberet*"; and, accordingly, Barclay's "have" may be a Latinism.

"Truely, wyse men *have* hym as suspect," etc.; "was *had* in great reputacion." Lord Berners, *The Golden Boke*, etc., (*ut sup.*), sig. G 3 r. and M 2 r.

"*Had* in most vile reputation"; "*had* in moost price." Roger Ascham, *Toxophilus* (1545), pp. 52, 113 (Mr. Arber's edition).

"And of this ariseth, that men . . . *have* them in very small reputation," etc. Sir Thomas Hoby (*ut sup.*), sig. N 7 v. See also sig. Q 8 r. "To be *had* in suspition of any vice." *Id., ibid.*, sig. Y 7 v.

"King Rycharde *had* them in suspition and gealosie." Richard Grafton, *Chronicle* (1569), vol. II, p. 149 (ed. 1809).

For *had*, with "in estimation," "in reputation," "in fear," "in veneration," see Nicholas Lichefield, *The First Booke of the Historie*, etc. (1582), fol. 34 v., 55 r., 84 r., 92 v.

"*Have* them in great estimation and admiration"; "we *have* the temples in great respect and reverence"; "*had* alwaies in singular recommendation." T. B., *The French Academie*, Part I (1586), pp. 383, 680, 711 (ed. 1589).

The Biblical "had in derison," "had in honour," and "had in reverence" present no difficulty to the run of readers; but it is all but certain that "I pray thee *have* me excused" is generally misunderstood, and by the educated as well as by the uneducated.

It is pertinent to remark, here, that *had*, for "should have,"³⁸ "would have," appeared in our language as far back, at least, as the

³⁸ *Should, should have*, etc., long had senses which, for the most part, now seem very strange,

"And thys daye rennyth a tale, that the Duke of Bretayne sholde be ded. I beleeff it not." Sir John Paston (1472), in the *Paston Letters*, vol. III, p. 60.

"I am informed that one of my brethren, late Bishop of Chichester, *should be departed*." Abp. Parker (1568), in *Correspondence, etc.* (1853), p. 331.

"Even as spitefully as unlearnedly, you affirm that Beza *should teach* that St. Luke wrote false Greek," etc. Rev. Dr. William Fulke, *A Defense*, etc. (1583), p. 135 (ed. 1843). And again at p. 138.

"Of his contre the signe was Thre fisshes, which he *shulde bere* Upon the penon of a spere." Gower, *Conf. Amant.*, vol. III, p. 56. See also vol. III, pp. 257, 298.

"And, as touchyng that poynt, that the seide maier and comminalte *sholde fayne and coloure* their answer with sotelnesse, yu desiryng of lenger delay, they remytte tham to your grete wysedomes," etc. John Shillingford (1448?), *Letters and Papers* (*ut sup.*), p. 132.

"Sir Thomas Howes hadde a free chapell at Castr, wher of the gyfte longyth to me, whyche chapell, as I understande, *scholde be* in the olde tyme, er the place at Caster wer bylte." Sir John Paston (1469), in the *Paston Letters*, vol. II, p. 339.

"At this question, al the lordes sat sore astonished, musyng much by whome thys question *should be ment*, of which every man wyst himselfe clere." Sir Thomas More, *Historie*, etc. (about 1513, *ut sup.*), p. 71.

"About this epistle hath ever been much doubting, and that among great learned men, who *should be* the author thereof." Tyndale, *Doctrinal Treatises*, etc. (*ut sup.*), p. 521.

"Socrates . . . saieth . . . he would followe him as though he *should followe* God himself." Sir Thomas Wilson, *The Rule of Reason* (1551), fol. 15 (ed. 1567). And see fol. 77 (bis.) Also *id.*, *The Arte of Rhetorike* (1553), fol. 99 (ed. 1567).

"The first guess is, what Damasus *should mean* by these words." Bp. Jewel (1565), *Works* (ed. 1845, etc.), vol. I, p. 160.

"But didst thou hear, without wondering, how thy name *should be hanged and carved upon these trees?*" Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, Act III, Scene II.

"Sir W. Warren told me how my Lord Brouncker *should take* notice of the two flaggons he saw at my house at dinner, at my late feast, and merrily, yet I know enviously, said I could not come honestly by them." Samuel Pepys (1667), *Diary*, etc. (*ut sup.*), vol. IV, p. 204. See also vol. IV, p. 398 (bis). We still say, for instance, "whom *should I meet*," etc., putting *should* for *did*, but only to express something unexpected.

"Don't forget the bailly of Hykelyng, who said I *should forge* [i. e., had forged] evidence," etc. Sir John Fastolf (1450), in the *Paston Letters*, vol. I, p. 168.

"And quatkin tre it *suld ha bene*, His eldres tald him all bedene." *Cursor Mundi* (about 1290), ll. 21579, 21580.

eleventh century ; and *would have* emerged as long ago, certainly, as the twelfth century.

The *had* in *had liefer* was rarely, it seems, a simple preterite. Primarily it implied, in this phrase, a condition, and then, dropping the implication of conditionality, became a sort of gnomic or adagial aorist.³⁹ It was, apparently, owing to the popularity which

"It is talkyd here how that ye and Howard *schuld a strevyn* togueder on the scher-daye, and on of Howards men *schuld a strekyn* yow twyess with a dagere, and soo ye schuld a ben hurt, but for a good dobelet that ye haddg on at that tyme." John Paston (1461), in the *Paston Letters*, vol. II, p. 42.

"Gods, if you *Should have* ta'en vengeance on my faults, I never Had lived to put on this." Shakespeare, *Cymbeline*, Act V, Scene I.

Should has, also, been used as expressive of the proximate future.

"Therfor, whan he *schuld deye*, the Cardinales saide he was not worthi to be biried in Seynt Petir cherche, for the habundauns of blood whech he had spilt. And he answerd ful sobirly," etc. Rev. John Capgrave, *Chronicle of England* (about 1464), p. 124 (1858).

"So, likewise, Christe, when he *should be taken* of the Jewes, saide to his Apostles, . . . 'slepe on, sirs, and take your rest,'" etc. Sir Thomas Wilson, *The Rule of Reason* (1551), fol. 69 (ed. 1567). Also *id.*, *The Arte of Rhetorike* (1553), fol. 77, 98 (ed. 1567).

"When he *should depart* from our ship, he required, by signes, of Nicholas Coello, to have his boat to carrie him to lande." Nicholas Lichefield, *The First Booke of the Historie*, etc. (1582), fol. 15 r.

These passages, a few out of scores collected from various sources, illustrate the laxity, in comparison with present usage, with which moods and tenses were occasionally employed, in former times.

For the age of *had*, for "should have," and that of *would have*, see Mr. T. L. Kington Oliphant's *Old and Middle English*, pp. 131, 177.

³⁹ The time when *had*, *went*, etc., long potential, began to be used quasi-aoristically was, I suspect, much more remote than I am now prepared to show it to have been.

"It semeth that it were skylful [*i. e.*, reasonable], and also necessary, that al these wardeyns *wente* to their pilgrims, for to kepe them redily fro malice of their enemyes." Lydgate (?), *The Booke*, etc. (1413, *ut sup.*), p. 7.

"If thou burnest blood and fat together to please God, what other thing dost thou make of God than one that *had* lust to smell to burning flotess [*i. e.*, scum]?" Tyndale, *Expositions*, etc. (*ut sup.*), p. 215.

"And, when he saith it is sin to believe too much, I say we *had* the more need to take heed what we believe, and to search God's word the more diligently, that we believe neither too much nor too little." *Id.*, *An Answer*, etc. (1530), in *Works* (Parker Society), vol. III, p. 95.

Had need will be treated of at length, before I shall have done. In this place I adduce a few passages in which, as just above, the expression is modified.

"Item, ther be dyvers of your tenantrys at Mauteby that *had* gret ned for to be reparyed ; at [for "yet"] the tenuants be so por that they ar not a [*i. e.* of]

attached to the word topically thus accepted, that *have liefer*, as if akin to a superfluity, was at no time in very great vogue.

Considering that the foregoing exposition, or the more essential part of it, cannot but be known to many students of older English, it is unexpected to be told, by Mr. Oliphant, that the verb in *had liefer* "reminds us of the Latin *mihi est*."⁴⁰

Closely allied to *had liefer* is *had as lief*, "should consider as equally acceptable," "would consider as equally acceptable."⁴¹ This expression, though, possibly, not so old as *had liefer*, is yet of venerable antiquity.⁴² The modern *would as lief*, like *would*

power to repare hem." Margaret Paston (1465), in the *Paston Letters*, vol. II, p. 176.

Bp. Joseph Hall wrote, in 1605: "Those which seek to mend the pace of time, spurre a running horse. I *had* more need to redeem it with double care and labour, then to seek how to sell it for nothing." *Works*, p. 41 (ed. 1648).

Also, in 1610, regarding a clergyman, as such: "No man *had* such need to keep a strict meane." *Ib.*, p. 314.

"They that worke hard all day *had* more need to rest then dance all night." William Prynne, *Histriomastix* (1633), p. 255.

The annexed passages, again from Tyndale, are also worthy of consideration.

"Where the officers be negligent, and the woman not able to put herself to penance, if she *went* where she is not known, and there marry, God is the God of mercy." *Expositions*, etc. (*ut sup.*), p. 52.

"For, if I were bound to do, or believe, under pain of the loss of my soul, anything that *were* not written, nor depended of that which is written, what holp me the scripture that is written?" *An Answer*, etc. (*ut sup.*), p. 26.

⁴⁰ *Old and Middle English*, p. 442. Professor F. J. Child writes: "I hadde lever = *j'aimerais mieux*; 'hadde' being, of course, in the subjunctive. Germ. *lieb haben*, 'to like,' is much the same." *Memoirs of the American Academy*, New Series, vol. IX, p. 312. The French equivalent here given is one of sense only, not one of syntax. *Lieber haben*, in some constructions, is not merely "much the same" as *had liefer*, but exactly correspondent to it; and the adjective *lieb* in *lieb haben* similarly answers to our *lief* in "had as lief."

Prof. George L. Craik, in his excellent *English of Shakespeare* (ed. of 1857, p. 89), explicitly teaches that *I had liefer* means "I should hold it preferable."

⁴¹ "I *had as lief go as stay*" originally imported "I should consider going to be equally acceptable with staying"; and, afterwards, its *had* was modified into a species of aorist. There is, in the phrase just instanced, more positive implication of conscious inclination than there is in "I *had liefer go*," "I *had rather go*."

⁴² First I may quote for it the *Chester Plays* (about 1328?), pp. 48, 72:

"In fayth, Noye, I *hade as leffe thou slepte*."

"I *hade as levee* my selfe to die, As thou, my deare darlinge."

"I *had as lefe be* in the wood." Anon. (*temp. Hen. VI?*), in *Reliquiae Antiquae*, vol. I, p. 3.

liefer, which is by no means of recent birth,⁴³ is justified by signi-

"The kyng, . . . saying that he *had as leef sette* his coroune biseide hym, as to se him were a cardinals hatte," etc. Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester (1440), in *Wars of the English in France*, vol. II (1864), p. 441.

"Sum man *had as lefe to dye*." Anon. (*temp. Hen. VI*), in *Reliquiae Antiquae*, vol. I, p. 74.

"I *had as lef be killid* of the in Ingland, as of a Sarasine in Surre." Rev. John Capgrave, *Chronicle of England* (about 1464), p. 141.

"They *had as leffe*, al most, be tenants to the Devell as to the Duke." Margaret Paston (1465), in the *Paston Letters*, vol. II, p. 194.

"We *had as leef to departe* from oure lyves." Sir Thomas Malory (*ut sup.*), vol. II, p. 366. See also vol. II, p. 154.

Further quotations might be given from the *Interlude of the Four Elements* (1510?), p. 18 (ed. 1848): Mary, Queen of France (1514), in Sir Henry Ellis's *Original Letters*, etc., First Series (ed. 1825), vol. I, p. 118: Lord Berners, *Froissart* (*ut sup.*), vol. I, p. 342; vol. II, pp. 186, 324: Tyndale, *An Answer*, etc. (*ut sup.*), p. 7: Sir Francis Bryan (1531), in *State Papers*, vol. VII (1849), p. 278: Sir Thomas More, *Apologye* (1533), fol. 224 v., 226 r.: Earl of Sussex and others (1540), in *State Papers*, vol. VIII, p. 302: Sir John Cheke (1554), in *Nugae Antiquae* (ed. 1804), vol. I, p. 49: Edward More (1557), in Utteron's *Select Pieces*, etc. (*ut sup.*), vol. II, p. 114: Sir Thomas Wilson, *The Arte of Rhetorike* (1553), fol. 71 (ed. 1567): Abp. Parker (*ut sup.*, 1573), p. 428: Anon., *New Custome* (1573), Act II, Scene III.

And so I might go on and refer to a great number of Elizabethan writers, including Bp. Pilkington, Thomas Nash, Llyly, Shakespeare, Chapman, Ben Jonson, etc., followed by Bp. Joseph Hall, Robert Burton, Dr. Peter Heylin, Sir Th. Browne, William Cartwright, Dr. Th. Fuller, Sir Roger L'Estrange, Aubrey, Sir William Temple, and many of their contemporaries and successors, among the latter of whom are Swift, Samuel Richardson, Goldsmith, "Junius," R. B. Sheridan, Gen. Conway. For still more recent patrons of *as lief*, and Horne Tooke's remark on *lief*, etc., see my *Doctor Indoctus* (1880), p. 50.

Have as lief, for a reason suggested where I discuss *have liefer*, is very much less common than *had as lief*. Some quotations for it follow:

"And thus a frere or a prest *hath as leve* to be seurerly a confessour of a lord or of a lady, as to be a simple bischop." Wycliffe, *English Works*, etc. (1880), p. 333. One MS. is said to have "mych *leve*."

"I *have as leef thy leesing* as thi soth saw." Anon., *Reply of Friar Daw Topias* (1401), in *Political Poems and Songs* (*ut sup.*), vol. II, p. 87.

"Happen what may happe, I *have as leef to abyde* my fortune as to seeke it and not fynde it." Mary, Queen of Scots (1568), in Sir Henry Ellis's *Original Letters*, etc., First Series (*ut sup.*), vol. II, p. 249.

I have lief was preceded by *me is lief*. "Let nothing to the be *lef*, Which to another man is *gref*." Gower, *Conf. Amant.*, vol. I, p. 370. And see note 20, *supra*.

⁴³ I recollect none but modern instances of *would as lief*. To this the older expression is changed by Thomas Sheridan, where Swift writes, in the Conclusion to *A Tale of a Tub*: "I *had as live* he may be the person as Congreve."

fications of *lief*, adjective and adverb,⁴⁴ that is to say, "willing" and "willingly," which I have not before had in view.

Here are oldish quotations for *would liefer*, with one for *would liefest*:

"But they that *wolde lever be* in the quier," etc. *Myroure of Our Ladye* (before 1450), p. 29. See also p. 264.

"They *lever wolde dye folys than byde a strype*." Rev. Alexander Barclay, *Shyp of Folys* (1509), vol. I, p. 257 (ed. 1874).

"He *wolde lever dye a marter*." Rev. William Roy and Jerome Barlowe, *Rede me and be nott wrothe* (1528), p. 42 (Mr. Arber's edition).

"Now see whether of these two conditions you *would leaver have*." Rev. Richard Bernard, *Terence in English* (ed. 1598), p. 213.

"Sir, my trust is, ye will not judge me unconstant for this universitie, in choice of my living, but rather one that *wold levest live* as I find myself fittest to serve my prince and my contreye." Roger Ascham (1553), in *Original Letters*, etc. (Camden Society, 1843), p. 18.

Compare the German: "Ich *will lieber ein armer Mann werden*, als erröthen vor ihm."

⁴⁴"The Almanz alle wer *lefe be suorn to be Inglis*" Robert Mannyng (*ut sup.*), p. 257. And see pp. 246, 339. For *lief*, "glad," "willing," as here, see also *William of Palerne* (*ut sup.*), l. 517: *Generydes* (about 1440), l. 5507: *Religious Pieces*, etc. (*ut sup.*), p. 80. Already in the Anglo-Saxon *Blickling Homilies*, p. 109, we have "inwit to *leof*," "too fond of guile." Chaucer's "I am nought *leef to gabbe*," in vol. I, p. 204, *Poetical Works*, is rendered, by Tyrwhitt: "I am not *pleased to prate*; I take no pleasure in prating."

Lief, joined with *loth*, "unpleasant," besides meaning "pleasant," as in Chaucer, vol. I, p. 147, often signified "willing," "consenting," "pleased," "glad"; *loth* bearing its present sense. For proofs, see Gower, *Conf. Amant.*, vol. I, p. 234; vol. III, pp. 13, 50; a poem called *On the Death of Edward III* (1377), and the *Libel of English Policy* (1436), in *Political Poems*, etc. (*ut sup.*), vol. I, p. 215, and vol. II, p. 162: *Townley Mysteries* (*ut sup.*), p. 71: *The Seven Sages* (15th century?), l. 1881: Skelton, *Poetical Works* (ed. 1843), vol. I, p. 309. See also Barclay's *Shyp of Folys*, vol. II, p. 103 (ed. 1874), the *lefe* at which place the editor wrongly defines by "agreeable."

In an erroneously explained passage in *Sir Gawayne*, etc. (*ut sup.*), l. 1251, *liefer* is equivalent to "gladder." And so it is in the *Townley Mysteries* (*ut sup.*), pp. 37, 40, 89. The first of these three passages runs: "Nay, yit were I *leyffer* my child were dede." Alexander Barclay has: "Sylla . . . sayd that he was sent from Marius, the consul, to enquire if he *wold lever* peace, or war." Translation of Sallust (*ut sup.*), fol. 83 v.

Of *liefest*, "gladdest," there is an instance in the last extract in the note immediately preceding.

Be leyf, by leyff, in the *Townley Mysteries* (*ut sup.*), pp. 164, 275, has been interpreted "farewell." Add *be lyve*, found in Mr. W. C. Hazlitt's *Remains*, etc., vol. I, p. 25.

Unleven, in the *Chester Plays* (*ut sup.*), vol. II, p. 10, looks like an error for *unleve*, "unwilling," "loth."

Before dismissing idioms in which *lief* and *liefer* play a part, I have to speak of a notable catachresis found in connexion with the

For the adverb *lief*, meaning "affectionately," "willingly," "voluntarily," "gladly," "fain," see *Story of Genesis and Exordus (ut sup.)*, l. 49: *Havelok the Dane (ut sup.)*, ll. 1888, 2606: *Morte Artur (ut sup.)*, l. 1035: *Townley Mysteries (ut sup.)*, p. 243: *Ludus Coventriæ (ut sup.)*, p. 267. "It is death to doe it: as *lefe* die as seek." Bp. Andrewes (1618), *XCVI Sermons* (ed. 1661), p. 111.

The comparative of this *lief* is synonymous with *sooner*, rather, in their secondary sense. "But *lever* than this worldes good She wolde have wist how that it stood." Gower, *Conf. Amant.*, vol. II, p. 46. See also vol. II, p. 92. "The Pope myght *lewy* wyshe to wype . . . by lissens, with hys brevys, then to send them," etc. Sir John Hackett (1533), in *State Papers*, vol. VII, p. 532. See also the Rev. Thomas Howes (1454), in the *Paston Letters*, vol. I, p. 307: Tyndale, *Expositions*, etc. (*ut sup.*), pp. 270, 275: George Cavendish (*ut sup.*), vol. I, p. 329.

As will be seen shortly, *had* was once saddled with a confusing variety of significations. This fact and others being remembered, perhaps it is not wholly certain that, in the following passage, *liefer* is not an adverb: "He seide *lever* he hadde lose the lesser frende than the greate frende." Richard Calle (1464), in the *Paston Letters*, vol. II, p. 161. And it may, I think, even be questionable how we are to take the same word in this verse of Spenser's: "For *lever* had I die then see his deadly face." However, the philological consciousness of any time but our own is a matter of most delicate handling.

Liefest, "most gladly," "fainest," occurs in Gower: "Alle women *levest* wolde Be sovereign of mannes love." *Conf. Amant.*, vol. I, p. 96. It signifies "most willingly," in some anonymous verses *On the Deposition of Richard II* (1399), in *Political Poems and Songs (ut sup.)*, vol. I, p. 372.

As has been pointed out, *lief*, "beloved," came to mean "loving," etc. In other words, at first objective, it got to be subjective, to boot. And this kind of change is by no means unexampled. Consider *dearly* in "dearly beloved," and then in "loving *dearly*." Sentiments may be *tender*, but not after the manner of a laudable beefsteak. *Preferable esteem*, for "esteem marking preference," and like phrases, abound in Samuel Richardson and some other authors of the last century. Again, the poet Gray has, in his second letter to West: "Do not think that I make a merit of writing to you *preferably* to a good supper." Lydgate has *credible* for *credulous*; and, in 1447, the Rev. H. Webber used *desiderable* for *desirous*. Bp. Fisher wrote, in 1509: "Our Lord hath herde my prayer, and also acceptably taken up my petycyon." *English Works*, Part I (1876), p. 21. Bp. Richard Mountagu and Feltham, respectively, make *disconsolate* qualify *darkness* and *misery*. *Comfortable* now has "enjoying ease" as one of its significations; and a phthisical patient, equally with his disease, is spoken of as *consumptive*.

On the other hand, subjective adjectives become objective. *Curious* and *suspicious*, in "a *curious* machine," "a *suspicious* circumstance," have many a fellow. Bp. Bale and James Sanford substitute *desirous* for *desirable*, just as Tacitus puts *credulus* for *credibilis*. See, for further germane particulars, my *Modern English*, pp. 167, 168, foot-note; and *On English Adjectives in -able*, etc., p. 77, foot-note 4.

latter of these words. Chaucer supplies several examples of it, as in :

" *Him hadde wel lever . . . That sche hadde had*," etc.

" *I dar wel say hire hadde lever a knyf*," etc.

" *Al had hir lever han had a knave childe*," etc.

" *Him had lever himselfe to mordre and dye*," etc.⁴⁶

For all the four passages, as here read, there is excellent manuscript authority ; and, as might be expected, the peculiarity which marks them is repeatedly paralleled in our older literature.⁴⁷ We

⁴⁶ *Poetical Works (ut sup.)*, vol. I, p. 206; vol. II, pp. 39, 138; vol. VIII, p. 91. Mr. Bell has, in the second passage, *sche* ; but *hire* (her) is the reading of several MSS., which, in the other passages, also, have the pronoun in the nominative.

Him seems, "it seems to him," I speak of elsewhere. But the same words have been used for "he seems."

" *Hym seemes wearey on his waye*"; "Greater then thou *hym seemes to be*."
Chester Plays (ut sup.), vol. II, pp. 51, 75.

" This lady was gyrd with a swerd with a thwong, al with gold apparyld. *Hyr semed* wel a lady of ful huge estate, as duchesse, or pryncesse; ne none was, that sawe hyr, that he ne tremblyd for drede." Lydgate (?), *The Booke of the Pylgremage*, etc. (1413, *ut sup.*), pp. 36, 37.

She seemed, used with equal lawlessness, occurs in the same work. See note 65, *infra*.

⁴⁷ In Mr. Utterson's *Select Pieces*, etc. (*ut sup.*), vol. I, p. 139, there occurs, in *Syr Degore*, an anonymous poem assigned to the beginning of the fourteenth century:

" *Me had lever than all my kyngdome here,*
" *That nowe is seased into my hande,*
" *That I were fayre out of this lande.*"

For two obscure passages, containing, respectively, *him had liefer* and *liefer had him*, see the anonymous *Richard Coer de Lion* (temp. Ed. I?), l. 3502 (in Weber's *Metrical Romances*), and the *Romans of Partenay* (about 1500-1520), l. 3205.

It is in place to adduce Shakespeare, *Richard II*, Act III, Scene III :

" *Me rather had my heart might feel your love,*
" *Than my unpleas'd eye see your courtesy.*"

I may add, from the *Ludus Coventriæ* (*ut sup.*), p. 274 :

" *On of you hath betrayed me,*
" *That at my borde with me hath ete :*
" *Bettir it hadde hym for to be*
" *Both unborn and unbegete.*"

Elsewhere, however, than in such phrases as those now before us, *had* has been used, carelessly enough, sometimes for *had been*, and sometimes for *were*, etc.

have, in them, a confusion of the ancient *him or her were liefer* and the later *he or she had liefer*. Of very slight weight, if of any at all, is the suggestion, that, in *him had liefer*, for instance, *him* is to be taken as an exclamation, with an ellipsis before it, and another after it; as if the sense were, "consider him: he had liefer."

I now proceed to investigate expressions of which "I had rather go than stay" and "I had rather that he stayed" are samples.

"I aunsuerd, yff my maister had, before the maryage, be laboured, hyt had moche esyer to bryng abouthe then now." William Worcester (1458), in the *Paston Letters*, vol. I, p. 433.

"At hes comyng, he undrestode ye were not there; and, if ye had, my Lorde desired you to come and spoken with hym." Richard Calle (1461), *ibid.*, vol. II, p. 55. And so Margaret Paston (1465), *ibid.*, vol. II, p. 208.

Samuel Pepys wrote, in 1661: "The Benevolence proves so little, and an occasion of so much discontent everywhere, that it had better it had never been set up." *Diary*, etc. (*ut sup.*), vol. I, p. 346.

According to a lection which, all circumstances weighed, may be the one we should accept, Shakespeare has, in the *Second Part of King Henry IV*, Act V. Scene IV: "Thou hadst better thou hadst struck thy mother, thou paper-faced villain."

"I hadde had goode inowe, And never more have needed to goon to the plough." Lydgate, *Minor Poems* (1840), p. 190.

"Other wyse, the sayd kyng had not so sone have returnyd in to Castyl." John Style (1509), in *Memorials of King Henry VII*, p. 433. Style's *had* is for *would*, or else implies necessity.

"Had not he have be, we shold never have retorne." Sir Thomas Malory (*ut sup.*), vol. I, p. 152.

"For, had nott yit that danger have been, I mygh [sic] yit have ben at home," etc. Sir John Paston (1475), in the *Paston Letters*, vol. III, p. 139. And so William Wayte (1450), *ibid.*, vol. I, p. 151; and often throughout the work.

"Cleanthes might well have fail'd in his judgment, had not accident have helped him to the obscured truth." Owen Feltham, *Resolves*, etc. (ed. 1696), p. 37.

"By all lyklyhode, yf any stuf or pouaire of Englisshe pouple had be here, he might never have had escaped, by reason, untaken." Bp. Bekynton (1442), in *Official Correspondence*, etc., vol. II, p. 213.

"For the which the seid Sir John, . . . wold have largely have recompensed." William Paston (1482?), in the *Paston Letters*, vol. III, p. 297.

Such extracts might be multiplied to any extent, with others exhibiting *hath* for *hath been*, *might* for *might be*, *would* for *would have*, *should* for *should be*, etc.

In the Scotch "he had obliged to go," the peculiarity, as I am informed by Dr. J. A. H. Murray, is not in its *had*, but in its *obliged*, which is to be taken adverbially, in the sense of "perforce."

Rathe, rather, rathest, "quick," "speedy," "hasty," "early," "quicker," "speedier," "prior," "former," "older," etc., were long in use, as adjectives; and so they were, as adverbs, signifying "soon," "sooner," "soonest," etc., etc.⁴⁷

If, owing to the natural prepossession entertained for what is established in existence, the adjective *rather*, like *first* and *foremost*, acquired, in succession to the sense of preceding in time, that of greater eligibility, there is no cause for surprise.

Robert of Gloucester⁴⁸ has "deye we *rather* wyth honour"; and Bp. Pecock⁴⁹ writes: "Certis, it is miche more likeli that, bi the stoon, the persooun of Peter schulde be undirstonde, *rather* than the persooun of Crist, or eny other thing than the persooun of Peter." While, in these passages, *rather* no longer points to comparative chronological position, it is, in the first of them, subjective, and, in the second, objective, and to be rendered, in turn, "preferently" and "preferably." In correspondence to the adverb thus altered

⁴⁷ *Rathe*, as a literary word, was falling into desuetude, when Milton sang of "the *rathe* primrose"; and it was the same with *rather* and *rathest*, in all their acceptations specified in the text. This being the case, the subjoined quotations are not without interest.

"Intending to aske her what shee made there at so *rathe* an hourre," etc. James Hayward, *The Banish'd Virgin* (1635), p. 191.

"First, I will begin with strawberries, as the first and *rathest* fruit in the beginning of summer." William Vaughan, *Directions for Health* (revised ed. of 1633), p. 55.

Bishop Sanderson, in 1647, used *rathest*, as an adverb, for "soonest." See his *Works* (ed. 1854), vol. I, p. 353. In the edition of 1681, vol. II, p. 198, *rarest* is given, by mistake.

"God makes no difference betweene the *rathnesse* and *latenesse* of time." James Hayward (as just above), p. 220.

It has not, to my knowledge, been recognized, by our recent lexicographers and glossarists, that, equally with the culinary *rare*—a contraction of *rather*—*rathe* has borne the sense of "undertaken." Littleton, in his *Latine Dictionary* (1684), renders *ovum sorbile* by "a *rathe* egg" and "a poached or *rath*-roasted egg." *Rere* I pass by.

Rather er, "sooner than," is seen in Gower, *Conf. Amant.*, vol. III, p. 45; and *rather or*, the same, in the notes to the *Chester Plays* (*ut sup.*), vol. II, p. 209.

"Our *rathers*" was used by Palsgrave (1530), for "our forefathers."

Wicliffe has the adjective *rathermore*, "former."

Likely grew from *like*; and *rathely*, adjective and adverb, was, of old, now and then put for *rathe*. The adverbs *rathelike* and *radly*, also, are found.

⁴⁸ *Chronicle* (about 1300), Hearne's ed. of 1810, p. 397.

⁴⁹ *Repressor* (about 1456), p. 441. See also pp. 106, 111, 112, 392, 423, 516.

in meaning,⁵⁰ the adjective *rather* would, of course, be synonymous with "preferent" and "preferable." As one with "preferent," it is unknown to me; but there is evidence, though it has escaped the attention of philologists, that it has actually been employed to import "preferable," "to be preferred," "better," "more important."

An anonymous poem, supposed to date before 1430, contains the couplet:

"It is *rathir* to bileeve the wageringe wiinde
Than the chaungeable world that makith men so blinde."⁵¹

Bp. Pecock is next to be adduced: "And, certis, in such aventure, it were *rather* to truse to the conscience and discretion of him which is in state of a reuler, than to the conscience of hem whiche ben in the state of hem that ben to be reulid."⁵²

Then comes Lord Berners, who contributes: "For I had [i. e., should deem] *rather* the welth [i. e., weal, welfare] of hym that hath maryed my doughter, than of hym that never dyd nothyng for me, though I have maryed his suster."⁵³

Sir Philip Sidney has: "Poesie . . . hath *rather* be troubled in the net with Mars, then enjoy the homelie quiet of Vulcan," etc.⁵⁴

⁵⁰ *Ratherest* is put, by Shakespeare, into the mouth of the pedantic Holofernes. But the word has been used in all gravity.

"For, if you otherwyse behave your selfe in the reading of it, it shall anon lose the vertue and quicknesse in stirring and moving of your soule, when you woulde *ratherest* have it sturred." Bp. Fisher (1535), *English Works*, Part I (*ut sup.*), p. 352.

"When you have most plentie, then *ratherest* provide against wante." William Barkar, *The Bookes of Xenophon*, etc. (1567), sig. E 4 v.

Among living provincial substitutes for *rather*, registered in various glossaries, are *ratherly*, *retherly*, *ratherlins*, *ratherlings*.

⁵¹ *Hymns to the Virgin and Christ*, etc. (1867), p. 86.

⁵² *Repressor* (*ut sup.*), p. 393.

⁵³ *Froissart* (*ut sup.*), vol. I, p. 41. Compare Lord Berners's "had rather the welth" with "have lever that love," "hadde levere a ribaudye," "have hit lever," "had lever . . . A day of pardon," and "I had hym lever," at p. 293, *supra*, text and foot-notes 29, 30. In connexion with the passage cited in the text, that which follows is, on several accounts, noteworthy. "What is that realme that sleeth theim that wold their welth, and are angry with theim that woulde helpe their yll?" Lord Berners, *The Golden Boke*, etc. (1534), sig. Hh 8 r (ed. 1546).

⁵⁴ *An Apologie for Poetrie* (1581), p. 61 (Mr. Arber's edition).

Samuel Pepys wrote, in 1667: "But her mother, by command of the Queen-mother, thought *rather* to bring her into England; and the King of France did give her a jewell," etc.⁵⁵

Also, the next year: "But it was denied, so furious they are against this bill: and thereby a great blow, either given to the King or Presbyters, or, which is the *rather* of the two, to the House itself," etc.⁵⁶

From an anonymous translation I take: "To have *rather* be indifferent in a sublime employment, than excellent in an indifferent, is a desire rendered excusable by generosity."⁵⁷

These extracts⁵⁸ being scattered over a space of two hundred and fifty years, or thereabouts, no doubt the discovery of many others to match them, belonging to that period, would reward continued research. Nor is the conjecture unreasonable, that, *had rather* apart, the infrequency of occurrence, in writing, of the special signification of *rather*⁵⁹ which they exemplify, may illustrate the fortune of a colloquialism. Quite possibly, the history of this *rather* may be compared with that of the word *palate*, in its sense of "uvula," so familiar to every American. *Palate*, thus understood, though a deviation from the living speech of the old country, classical and provincial alike, may fairly be inferred, from forth-

⁵⁵ *Diary*, etc. (*ut sup.*), vol. IV, p. 313. "Thought *rather*" I take to mean, here, "judged it to be *better*"; but I am not blind to the possibility, the bare possibility, of wresting another sense from the words.

⁵⁶ *Diary*, etc. (*ut sup.*), vol. V, p. 184. This passage was indicated to me, before I had read Pepys with an eye to his language, by Dr. J. A. H. Murray, whom I have to thank for the quotation next following, also. Both are from the vast magazine of extracts destined for the great *English Dictionary* now in preparation.

⁵⁷ *Gracian's Courtier's Manual Oracle, done into English* (1685), p. 18.

⁵⁸ Those which follow, as being, at least at first sight, less cogent, are assigned a subordinate position:

"For I had *rather* then any good, that this kinde of people were driven sum-
wher oute of my sight," etc. Ralph Robinson, Translation of *Utopia* (1556),
p. 52 (Mr. Arber's edition).

"Before God, I had *rather* then an angell [the coin so called] I had chosen
some other." Thomas Deloney, *Thomas of Reading* (1632), p. 24 (ed. 1827).

Not wholly irrelevant is even this: "I had *rather* anything, almost, than that
you should strain yourselves," etc. Swift (1711), *Works* (ed. 1778), vol. XIII,
p. 241.

⁵⁹ The adverb *rather*, "preferably," may have forerun the adjective to which it answers. Still, *rather*, as it was of old an adjective, and one bearing senses from which its later sense could be readily developed, differs very widely, as importing "preferable," from the adjectives *often*, *seldom*, and *soon*, which are, without dispute, transmutations of adverbs.

coming facts,⁶⁰ to have belonged, at least for some time, to the accepted vocabulary of educated Englishmen. The dictionaries of our day will be explored for it in vain.

And now it is submitted whether *had rather*, in "we *had rather go* than stay,"⁶¹ was not, with those who originally used the

Except to very recent dictionaries, *rather*, "somewhat," is as unknown as *rather*, "preferable." See p. 282, note 5, *supra*.

To enumerate the various shades of meaning which have attached to the adverb *rather*, is beyond the scope of my present paper.

⁶⁰ "The *palat* of his mouth was down, when hee lay upon his *pallet*." Richard Hodges, *The Plainest Directions for the True Writing of English*, etc. (1649), p. 15. Hodges speaks of the two words italicized as "altogether alike in sound."

"My cold and pain in my head increasing, and the *palate* of my mouth falling, I was in great pain all night." Samuel Pepys (1664), *Diary*, etc. (*ut sup.*), vol. III, p. 49.

Adam Littleton (*ut sup.*) explains *columella*, the medical term, as "the swelling of the uvula, or falling down of the *palate* of the mouth." Guy Miege, in his *Great French Dictionary* (1687, 1688), gives, as the definition of *luette*, "the *palate*, or uvula, a little piece of spongy flesh in the root of the roof of the mouth"; and he also has: "The *palate* of the mouth down, *la luette abbatue*."

In various English dialects, the *uvula* is now called the *kecker*, the *pin of the throat*, etc.

⁶¹ "For the poer man *had rather have* a 100 marks in hand than a 100 pound by any assignement," etc. Sir John Fortescue (about 1471), *Works* (1869), p. 454.

"Ellys, by my trowthe, I *had rather that ye never maryed* in yowyr lyffe." Margaret Paston (1478), in the *Paston Letters*, vol. III, p. 231.

"Yett *haid I rether dye*, For his sake, ons agayne." Anon. (15th century), in *Reliquiae Antiquae*, vol. I, p. 72.

"For ye sayd ye *had rather lose* the towne." William Joddopkan (about 1481), in the *Plumpton Correspondence* (Camden Society), p. 42. *Had* is a preterite here.

"I trow you *had rather have* it of my owne hand," etc. German Pole (about 1499), *ibid.*, p. 140. Also *id.* (1504), *ibid.*, p. 193.

"For i *hadde rather have* no parte off hys goodds," etc. Dean Richard Pace (1513?), in Sir Henry Ellis's *Original Letters*, etc. (*ut sup.*), Third Series (1846), vol. I, p. 176.

"They *had rather that* their lorde therle shulde take to his wyfe the kyng of Englandes doughter," etc. Lord Berners, *Froissart* (*ut sup.*), vol. I, p. 168.

"Of trouth, if it laie in my handes to do, I *had rather gyve* lyfe to a simple oxe than to a malicious ideot." *Id.*, *The Golden Boke*, etc. (1534), sig. N 1 r. (ed. 1546). Similar to these two passages there are some forty others in the works from which they are taken.

expression, simply substituted for *had liefer*, as consciously an exact synonym of it. Indeed, the attitude of suggestion, on this

"They do all things of a good zeal, they say: they love so well, that they *had rather burn* you than that you should have fellowship with Christ." Tyndale, *Doctrinal Treatises, etc.* (*ut sup.*), p. 43. See also pp. 101 and 523.

"I *had rather have spent* a crowne." Roger Ascham, *Toxophilus* (1545), p. 28 (Mr. Arber's edition). And at p. 30. Also *id.*, *The Scholemaster* (1563-1568), pp. 51, 78, 131, 159 (Mr. Arber's edition).

"I *had rather referre* that to Abell, Adams sonne." Thomas Langley, *Abridged Translation of Polydore Vergil* (1546), fol. 66 (ed. 1551).

"I *had rather louse* it." Robert Savill (1546?), in the *Plumpton Correspondence* (*ut sup.*), p. 251.

"If Marcus Attilius Regulus *had rather lose* his life then," etc. Sir Thomas Wilson, *The Rule of Reason* (1551), fol. 33 (ed. 1567). Here *had* is a preterite. See also fol. 80 (bis).

"No, I *had rather be torn* in pieces, and slaine." Rev. Nicholas Udall, *Roister Doister* (before 1553), Act IV, Scene V.

"Let them, therefore, have him in admiracion, honour him, reverence him, folowe him, who so ever *hade rather perishe* than to be saved." J. Olde, *Antichrist* (1556), fol. 122. See also fol. 165, 182, 187.

"I *had rather be good* then wilie." Ralph Robinson, *Translation of Utopia* (*ut sup.*), p. 23. See also pp. 24, 38, 62, 84, 90, 92, 98, 121, 140 (bis), 142.

"They *hadde rather obey* him then you." William Barkar, *The Bookes of Xenophon*, etc. (1567), sig. T 8 v. See also sig. Y 7 r.

"They *had rayther suffer* destruction to overtake them," etc. Stephen Gosson, *The Schoole of Abuse*, etc. (1579), p. 65 (Mr. Arber's edition). And see pp. 68, 73 (bis).

"Plato, therefore, whose authoritie I *had much rather conster* then unjustly resist," etc. Sir Philip Sidney, *An Apologie for Poetrie* (1581), p. 58 (Mr. Arber's edition). See also pp. 24, 36, 59.

"I *had rather die* then suffer so long time . . . I *had rather die* then to tarrie upon the same." Nicholas Lichefield, *The First Booke of the Historie*, etc. (1582), fol. 40 v.

"So they *had rather say*," etc. Rev. Gregory Martin (1582), in Fulke, about to be quoted, p. 249. And see pp. 422, 527, 569.

"So I *had rather call* them." Rev. Dr. William Fulke, *A Defense*, etc. (1583, *ut sup.*), p. 72. And in ten other places.

"I *had rather seate* myselfe there," etc. Sir Walter Raleigh (1584), in Bliss's *Letters*, etc. (*ut sup.*), vol. II, p. 521.

"We . . . *had rather die* than turne from the lawes of our God." T. B., *The French Academie* (1586, *ut sup.*), p. 92. And so twenty-three times again.

"Had I rather now *laugh*, and heereafter *weepe*, then now *weepe*, and heereafter *laugh*, not for dayes, or yeares, but for ever and ever?" Bp. Babington, *A Profitable Exposition*, etc. (1588), p. 127 (ed. 1615).

"Yet had I rather any thing *befall* me, then loose my sonne." Rev. Richard Bernard, *Terence* (*ut sup.*), p. 249.

point, is warrantably changed to that of contention, when it is seen that the infinitive after *had rather* was frequently introduced along with the rhematic sign;⁶² a circumstance which definitively excludes

Noteworthy is the vulgarism in the following: "But I *had rather have* your rome *as your companie*." Anon., *Marriage of Wit and Wisdom* (1579?), p. 27 (ed. 1846).

"*Had* the Apostles *rather a man should perish* of famine then be releived of his owne?" Edward Brerewood (died 1613), *A Second Treatise of the Sabbath* (1632), p. 17. Here, with some probability, *had* is preteritive.

In the *Chester Plays* (*ut sup.*), vol. II, p. 166, is the line: "Whether *had* you *rather have* paine, or blesse?" Those plays are referred to about 1328, but are printed as they were transcribed in 1592; and the editor remarks, in vol. II, p. 210, that "the persons who made the various copies from the original MS. of the *Chester Plays* took great liberties with the text." Hence I attach very little credit to the evidence of those plays, that *had rather* was known in the fourteenth century. The earliest date at which I have found it is recorded at the beginning of this note; a date which ill comports either with Dr. Johnson's opinion, or with Dr. Crombie's assertion, as to its age, already cited in this paper.

⁶² They *had rather to be taxed* yerely, to the halfe of theyr substances, than to be under the handes of the Englischemen." Lord Berners, *Froissart* (*ut sup.*), vol. I, p. 266. See also vol. I, p. 562.

"I *had rather to bee Cato*," etc. *Id.*, *The Golden Boke*, etc. (*ut sup.*), sig. L 7 r. See also sig. C 6 r, O 4 r, Dd 2 r.

"I thincke thou *haddest rather alyve to be flayne*." Anon., *Thersytes* (1537).

"*Rather had they to dwell* still in the earthly beggary," etc. Bp Bale (1550), *Select Works* (1849), p. 439.

"He counted it much better for himself, and *had rather to be loosed* than to live." Bp. Nicholas Ridley (1555), *Works* (1841), p. 425. *Had*, pretty certainly, is a preterite here.

"They love no more strawe; they *had rather to fast*." Thomas Tusser, *A Hundreth Good Poyntes of Husbandrie* (1557), st. 40.

"And, for so much (quoth he) as thou *haddest rather to conveye* awaie the rebell and traytour to our gods, then deliver him up," etc. Rev. Dr. Thomas Stapleton, *The History*, etc. (*ut sup.*), fol. 17.

"I *had rather . . . to use* the common accustomed speache of all men, then the odious new termes of a fewe." *Id.*, *A Fortresse of the Faith*, etc. (1565), fol. 3. See also fol. 29.

"The like is reported, in divers histories, of the Grecians at this day, who doe hate so much the name and dominion of the Latines, as they *had rather to endure* all the miseries which dayly they suffer under the Turke, for their religion, and otherwise, then, by calling for aid from the west, to hazard the subjection to the said Latines." Rev. Robert Parsons, *Leycesters Commonwealth* (1584), p. 6 (ed. 1641).

"Yet, alas! how much *rather had* you, I know, *to have still enjoyed*, then thus supplyed his life!" Rev. John Gaule, *A Defiance to Death* (1630), *The Epistle Dedicatore*.

the supposition that *had* there ungrammatically supplanted an auxiliary. If instances of "we *have rather go*," and the like, are extremely rare, it is, I surmise, because *have liefer* was fast waning

" Wherefore he contracted with all the graziers and rich farmers thereabouts, who *had rather to give* him, every quarter, a certain sum of money, then to be liable to those thefts and dangers, both by day and night." Anon., *Robin Hood* (1662), p. 7 (ed. 1827). *Had* is here in the past tense.

Before *had rather* arose, *would rather* had obtained for ages. Its *rather*, besides being an adverb, is subjective.

As preterite of the notional verb *will*, *would* used to be connected with a following verb by *to*.

" Elles we *wolde* truly to *have had* tyme," etc. John Shillingford (1448), *Letters and Papers* (Camden Society), p. 55. See also pp. 40, 47, etc., etc.

" Jac Napes *wolde*, one the see, a maryner to *ben*." Anon. (about 1450), in *Political Poems*, etc. (*ut sup.*), vol. II, p. 232.

" It semyth, be my moders langage, that she *wold* never so fayn to *have be delyveryd* of her as she woll now." Margaret Paston (1453), in the *Paston Letters*, vol. I, p. 251.

" It was uncertayne, it was hyd, what the wysdome of God *wolde to be understande* by this aspercyon or sprenklynge of blode." Bp. Fisher (1509), *English Works*, Part I (1876), p. 110.

" Who that hath wisedome *would* rather deafe to *be*, Then dayly to heare such vile enormitie." Rev. Alexander Barclay, *Egloges* (*ut sup.*), sig. B 2 r. (ed. 1570).

" He thought I *wolde* not, for a thowsand pounds, *to ren*, onlesse I were as well trymmed as I have byn in tymes past." Edward, Duke of Buckingham (1516 to 1521), in Sir Henry Ellis's *Original Letters*, etc., Third Series (*ut sup.*), vol. I, p. 216.

" Here I *would* not More to *slit* from his literal plain sense." Tyndale (1533), in *Works* (Parker Society), vol. III, p. 252.

" Therfore it were no marvaile that Saincte Frauncis *wolde* his brethern *to be obedient* to the Bisshoppe of Rome, being their prelate." Roland Lee and Thomas Bedyll (1534), in *Letters on the Suppression of the Monasteries* (Camden Society), p. 43.

" The goddes ymmortall *wold* hym to bee borne into this world." Rev. Nicholas Udall (before 1557), in *Original Letters*, etc. (Camden Society), p. 5.

" Certainte Jewes, hearing Christians swearing in most fearful maner, as if they meant to have pulled Christ out of Heaven, said they wondred they *would to outrage* him, if they did beleeve that he died for them." Anon., *A World of Wonders* (1607), p. 39.

" I *would* rather never to *have* light, than not to *have* it always: I *would* rather not *to have* light, than not to communicate it." Bp. Joseph Hall (died 1656), *Works* (ed. 1837, etc.), vol. XI, p. 98. See also p. 100 of the same vol.

It may be noted that the past participle *would*, whose existence " Webster's" *Dictionary* denies, occurs not only in Chaucer and Lord Berners, but in Dr. Donne's *Auncient History of the Septuagint*, p. 216 (ed. 1633). Moreover, Bp. Sanderson, in 1620, used the substantives *woulder* and *woulding*.

to obsoleteness, when *had rather* came in. Still more prochronous would be "*us were rather go.*"

In order to explain *had rather*, I recurred to *had liefer*. It is needful, however, to go back a stage further, or to, for instance, "*us were liefer go*," the precursor of "*we had liefer go*," in order to work out the rationale of "*we had better go*."⁶³ Punctually analogous to "*us were liefer go*" is our remote forefathers' "*us were better go*."⁶⁴ Of this there first sprang up a corruption,

Now, for those who may choose to look upon the *had*, in *had rather to*, as an auxiliary, and as having been put, by carelessness, for the notional *would*, there is no escape, that I can see, from the further assumption, that the *to* of their superseded *would rather to* was retained by still greater carelessness. But, even if the *to* were away, and the *would* were not notional, why should the auxiliary *had* of such theorists have usurped the rights of another word, and in violation of syntax? An appeal to the *had* of *had better* is nothing helpful.

As to *would rather*, the following extracts exhibit it in unwonted contexts:

"How many that lyve in horrable synne, that yet have the faythe of Chryst Iesu, and *wolde rather dye* or they shold renye theyr faythe! But, for all that, they be not justyfyed." Bp. Fisher (1521), *English Works* (*ut sup.*), p. 328.

"I have conceived that hope of your goodnes, that ye *wold rather my person to bee saved then spilled*." Rev. Nicholas Udall (bef. 1557), in *Original Letters*, etc. (*ut sup.*), p. 4.

⁶³ Under *had*, Dr. Johnson writes: "'I *had better*,' 'you *had better*,' etc., means the same as '*it would be better for me or you*,' or '*it would be more eligible*.' It is always used potentially, not indicatively; nor is *have* ever used to that import." And then come quotations for *had rather* and *had better*, though the former of them has not been mentioned, and though the definition given of the latter does not fit it. There is nothing to show that Dr. Johnson knew what *had better* succeeded; and it is plain that he was unacquainted with the preteritive *had rather*, and with the old "I *have liefer*," "I *have as lief*," etc.

⁶⁴ "Better him *wer* with eise in clostre *haf led* his life." Robert Mannyng (*ut sup.*), p. 172. See also pp. 91, 198. "So betere him *wære*" is the Anglo-Saxon of *St. Mark*, ix, 42.

"And therfore *you is better* hyde youre counseil in youre herte," etc.; "The is better holde thy tonge stille than to speke." Chaucer, *Poetical Works*, vol. III, pp. 142, 147.

"*Betere me were ded* Then thus alyve to be." Anon. (*temp. Ed. II, or earlier*), in *Reliquiae Antiquae*, vol. I, p. 122.

"*Into the whiche if that he slide, Him were better go* beside." Gower, *Conf. Amant.*, vol. III, p. 241. See also vol. II, pp. 94, 296; vol. III, p. 14.

"*Hym hade bene better* in good faye, *Hade spared oyntmente* that daie." *Chester Plays* (*ut sup.*), vol. II, p. 12.

"*Hym were bettyr never to be sayn* On lyve, be nyth ne day." *Ludus Coventriae* (*ut sup.*), p. 38.

"*Me were bettur be hengud and drawyn*." Anon., *Thomas and the Fairy Queen* (before 1450?), in Mr. Halliwell's *Illustrations*, etc. (1845), p. 65.

"we were better go";⁶⁵ and then, the dissimilarity of *had better*

"*Hem were beter take the furre,*" etc. Anon., *Knight of La Tour-Landry* (about 1372?), p. 31.

"*The Duck had be beter then a mli. that it had never be don.*" Margaret Paston (1465), in the *Paston Letters*, vol. II, p. 250.

"*Whether is me better to treate with Kynge Arthur, or to fyghte?*" Sir Thomas Malory (*ut sup.*), vol. I, p. 56. See also vol. I, pp. 12, 29, 237; vol. II, p. 262.

⁶⁵ "She hadd ben beter to have ben stille, thanne to have reproved a man opinly afore the compayne." *Knight of La Tour-Landry* (*ut sup.*), p. 32.

"*Thowe haddyst be better have gold or fee: More nede thereto thou hade.*" Anon., *Sir Cleges* (14th century?), ll. 425, 426.

"*Bettur he were, to yow sey y, So to do, then for hunger dye.*" Anon., *Kynge Roberd of Cysille* (about 1390?), in Mr. W. C. Hazlitt's *Remains*, etc., vol. I, p. 278.

"*I ware the better dye.*" Anon. (15th century), in *Reliquiae Antiquae*, vol. I, p. 73.

"*Thou hadest ben better have be a myle behynde,*" etc. *Merlin* (*ut sup.*), p. 652.

"*I were better be hangyd.*" *Townley Mysteries* (*ut sup.*), p. 99. See also pp. 187, 234.

"*Peraventure he had ben better to have performyd my desyer.*" John Paston (1477), in the *Paston Letters*, vol. III, p. 197.

"*He were better to ben hylte.*" *Ludus Coventriae* (*ut sup.*), p. 401. See also pp. 284, 349.

"*Thou were better flee by tymes.*" Sir Thomas Malory (*ut sup.*), vol. I, p. 202.

Additional apposite passages are at hand from the Rev. Alexander Barclay, Lord Berners, Tyndale, Sir Thomas More, H. Brincklow (about 1542), Bp. Jewel, Roger Ascham, J. Sanford (1569), Stephen Gosson, Sir Philip Sidney, Nicholas Lichfield, George Whetstones, the Rev. Robert Parsons, Bp. Babington, Gabriell Harvey, Anthony Munday, Bacon, Shakespeare, Dr. Donne, Ben Jonson, the Rev. Robert Burton, Thomas Randolph, John Wilson, and so on, till past the Restoration.

Extracts lie before me, in which occur *me, us, thee, you, him, her, them, —dread, lacketh, liketh, list, loathe, needs, ought, repenteth*, and the like; that is to say, the dative case where we now put the nominative, and the verb in regimen, not, as at present, in agreement. Even Sir Thomas More has "*me needeth not to bost.*" Relics of this construction remain in the concretions *methinks*, *methought*, and *meseems*. According to Dr. Johnson, who rightly apprehended *meseems*, *methinks* is "not easily reconciled to grammar," is "an ungrammatical word," and "is imagined to be a Norman corruption; the French being apt to confound *me* and *I*." Is *methinks*, then, for *I thinks?* While it would have been prudent, in the lexicographer, to let the French alone, it would have called for only a very moderate acquaintance with old English, to introduce him to "*me, him, us, think or thinketh*," "*him, her, them, us, thought*," etc., including Sir Thomas More's *me thinking*, or "*seeming to me*"; *think* having had, of yore, two meanings. Answerable to *methinks* is the German *mich dünkt*.

to *had liefer* and *had rather* passing unheeded, appeared the phrase now established.⁶⁶ Much the same is to be said of *had*

My thinks and *my thought*, used by the Rev. William Baldwin (1563), and *my thinketh*, besides these, in *New Custome* (1573), are simply bad spellings. *Methoughts*, used by the Rev. William Cartwright, Addison, and others, is a gross error.

Such constructions as *him likes*, etc., we have laid aside; but we have not allowed *it pleases me* to be ousted by the newer *I please*. Certain innovations in the same direction as *I please* and *he likes* have, however, been attempted ineffectually. "He behoved to bringe his wif." *Merlin* (*ut sup.*), p. 295. And see p. 403. This is still Scotch. "I . . . wyl nought dishonouren the honeste of wymmen with so fowle a name as *she semyd* worthy." *Lydgate* (?), *The Booke*, etc. (1413, *ut sup.*), p. 63. "Yf ye seme hit be over-longe or ye have ansuere," etc. Bp. Bekynton (1442), in *Official Correspondence*, etc. (*ut sup.*), vol. II, p. 184. The Bishop's *it is seemed* and *it shall be seemed* may just be noted here. "For a lady soo ledde the where thow semyd thy broder was slayne." *Sir Thomas Malory* (*ut sup.*), vol. II, p. 273.

By this time it must be patent, in good part, if not altogether, why "*us were better go*" was displaced by "*we were better go*." I express myself thus, because, possibly, the supersession of the former by the latter was owing, in some measure, to the fact that *better* implies, besides the conferring of advantage, the receiving of it. An old translator has: "For they wold not byleven hit. Soo sholde they never be the *better*, though that it were told them." *Lydgate* (?), *The Booke*, etc. (1413, *ut sup.*), p. 72. And Tyndale writes: "If I be *good* for the offering of a dove, and *better* for a sheep, and yet *better* for an ox, and, soever the *better* thing I offer, the *better* I am, oh, how accepted should I be, if I offered a man, and, namely, him that I most loved!" *An Answer*, etc. (*ut sup.*), p. 66.

Landor, personating Isaac Barrow, discourses as follows: "Among the few crudities and barbarisms that yet oppressed our language, in his learned age, Bacon has this: 'A man *were better rise* in his suit.' Indeed, he uses *were better* more than once, with the simple verb after it, and without *to*." *Works and Life* (*ut sup.*), vol. IV, p. 381.

Just as we still say *deserving his attention* or *deserving of his attention*, Dr. Johnson, and sundry of his contemporaries, as Goldsmith and Sir Joshua Reynolds, occasionally omitted *of* after *worthy* and *unworthy*; and, so long as the omission was held to be optional, they committed no barbarism. On similar grounds, neither did Bacon commit one, in slighting *to* after *were better*. The elegant Sir Thomas Wilson (1560) did not hesitate to write even: "If others never gette more by booke then I have doen, *it wer better be* a carter then a scholar, for worldlie profite." *The Arte of Rhetorike* (ed. 1567), sig. A 5 r.

A Landorian attempt at a genetic explication of *were better rise* would, doubtless, have been a curiosity.

⁶⁶ None but very finical stylists scruple, now-a-days, at *had better*. Lord Macaulay has it once in his *History*, and five times elsewhere. *Had rather*, however it may be in conversation, has gradually been falling into disfavour, with the best authors, during the last eighty years. Lord Macaulay uses it only three times.

best, towards deducing its origin, as has been said of *had better*.⁶⁷

In the pages of Jane Austen, Lord Byron, "George Eliot," Mr. Matthew Arnold, Mr. Leslie Stephen, and Mr. W. H. Mallock, I find *had better* twenty-nine times; *had rather*, only twice. But in Cowper, of the last century, while there are four instances of the former, there are seven of the latter.

Of the three old quotations for *had better* which immediately follow, the first may belong to the days when the expression was still a novelty.

"They *had better have fet* me an errande at Rome." Anon., *Thersytes* (1537).

"Who livethe in cowrtes muste marke what they saie; Who livethe for ease *had better live awaie.*" Sir John Harington (1594), in *Nugae Antiquae*, vol. I, p. 168 (ed. 1804).

"The Israelites *had better have wanted* their quailes, then to have eaten them with such sauce." Bp. Joseph Hall (1605), *Works* (ed. 1648), p. 45.

It is from no want of material, from the days of Queen Elizabeth onward, that I do not add to these quotations by hundreds.

"*Better he had to have be away*" occurs in *Torrent of Portugal*, l. 1186. The manuscript, avowedly a very careless one, from which this poem is printed, is referred, by its editor, Mr. Halliwell, to the fifteenth century. I am rather sceptical that *had better* dates back so far.

⁶⁷ Quotations for *had best* and its forerunners may be despatched summarily.

"*Yete me is best take mi chaunce.*" Anon., *Lay le Freine* (14th century?), l. 107.

"*And in the meane while he cast What thing him were best to do.*" Gower, *Conf. Amant.*, vol. II, p. 306. And see vol. III, p. 38.

"*He wyste not what he was beste to do.*" Anon., *Cronycle*, etc. (1483, *ut sup.*), sig. Q 6 v.

"*She, . . . doutfull, in her mynde, what she were best to do,*" etc. Bp. Fisher (1509), *English Works* (*ut sup.*), p. 292.

"*Ye are best to retourne into Fraunce*"; "*Ye were beste so to do.*" Lord Berners, *Froissart* (*ut sup.*), vol. II, pp. 723, 725.

"*Ye were best . . . to revive againe.*" Rev. Nicholas Udall, *Roister Doister* (*ut sup.*), Act III, Scene III.

"*Ye were best to keep still*"; "*I think he were best to be a little colder in his zeal.*" Abp. Parker (1565, 1574), in *Correspondence*, etc. (*ut sup.*), pp. 238, 459.

Add Thomas Ingelend (about 1550?), Bp. James Brooks (1555), Dr. Robert Recorde (1556), Rev. Dr. Meredith Hanmer (1581), Rev. Dr. William Fulke (1583), Rev. Richard Bernard (1598), Anthony Munday, Rev. Robert Greene, Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, and a host of unnamed authors, the latest of them writing after 1660. More than half of them have *were best to*. *He was best to* is seen in Richard Johnson's *Tom a Lincolne* (1635), p. 30 (ed. 1828); and in the anonymous *Ariana* (1636), p. 102.

"*You had best omit the worke.*" Dr. William Cunningham, *The Cosmographical Glasse* (1559), p. 61.

"*Thou hadst best to prove me, whether I can reede.*" Anon., *Newe Custome* (1573), Act I, Scene I.

"*I had best go back*"; "*You had best to use your sword better, lest I beswinge you.*" Rev. Robert Greene, *Dramatic Works* (ed. Rev. A. Dyce), vol. I, pp. 37, 51.

Comparable with *had as lief*, as concerns form, if not as having had an analogous ancestor,⁶⁸ and with *had better*, in respect that it involves an abusive employment of *had*, is the phrase *had as good*. “*Us were as good go*”⁶⁹ was succeeded by “*we were as good go*”;⁷⁰ and that, by “*we had as good go*.⁷¹”

“*And you had best say*,” etc.; “*You had best go dreame againe*.” Anon., *First Part of the Contentions*, etc. (1594), in *First Sketches*, etc. (1843), pp. 40, 68.

A large number of other authorities being omitted, I pass to De Foe: “*I could not well tell what I had best to do*.” *Robinson Crusoe* (1719), vol. I, pp. 36, 37 (ed. 1840).

Had best, followed by *to*, is still current among the vulgar. Without this addition, it has all along, from William III's time to this day, been common in writings of a familiar style, and is also to be met with, here and there, in books of a graver cast. For instance, “*had best be settled*” occurs in Mr. Bernard Cracraft's thoughtful *Essays* (1868), vol. I, p. 85; and “*I had best not give her any*,” in Mr. W. H. Mallock's *New Republic*, p. 145 (ed. 1878).

⁶⁸“*Us were as lief go*,” or the like, though a style of expression which all but certainly once existed, I have not yet come upon, whereas I have come upon an expression akin to “*us were as good go*,” as will be seen presently.

⁶⁹“*Me had been as good to goo To the brynnynge fyre of hell*.” Anon., *Thomas and the Fairy-queen*, in Mr. Halliwell's *Illustrations*, etc. (*ut sup.*), p. 66.

⁷⁰“*A man were as good to be dede As smell therof the stynk*.” Anon. (*temp. Hen. VI?*), in *Reliquiae Antiquae*, vol. I, p. 3.

“*One were, in a maner, as good be slayne*.” Anon. (15th century?), in Utter-son's *Select Pieces*, etc. (*ut sup.*), vol. II, p. 36.

“*A man had ben as good to have be smydden with thonder*.” Anon., *Lyfe of Roberte the Devyll*, in Mr. W. C. Hazlitt's *Remains*, etc., vol. I, p. 233.

If, as is quite possible, these three extracts have datives in connexion with *were* and *had been*, they belong to the note immediately preceding this.

“*We were as good to go towardes Flaunders as to Boloyne*.” Lord Berners, *Froissart* (*ut sup.*), vol. I, p. 754.

“*A man were as good, in a maner, to come in to the paynys of hell*,” etc. Henry Brinklow, *Complaynt*, etc. (about 1542), p. 24 (ed. 1874).

“*Then I were as good to saye nothinge*.” Ralph Robinson, Translation of *Utopia* (1556), p. 66 (Mr. Arber's edition).

“*You were as good speake to one that is dead*.” Rev. Richard Bernard, *Terence*, etc. (*ut sup.*), p. 453.

“*He were as good be hanged as once deny her*.” Henry Porter, *Pleasant Historie*, etc. (1599), p. 38 (ed. 1841).

“*I were as good save five or six pound, as not, uncle*.” Ben Jonson, *Every Man out of his Humour* (1599), Act II, Scene I.

“*The poore seculars were as good to be all hanged up togetherward, as live*,” etc. Rev. William Watson, *A Decacordon of Ten Quodlibeticall Questions*, etc. (ed. 1602), p. 174.

“*He were as good go a mile on his errand*.” Shakespeare, *Measure for Measure*, Act III, Scene II. See also *Troilus and Cressida*, Act II, Scene I; *Titus Andronicus*, Act IV, Scene III.

Those who, in these later days, use *had rather* and *had as lief*, doubtless imagine that *rather* and *lief* are there adverbs. Their sense of grammatical propriety being, hence, doubly offended by *had as good*, because of its adjective, an attempt at reducing error has been made in the substitute *had as well*. This, though it now and then creeps into books,⁷² is, however, well nigh wholly restricted to conversational currency, as are the very much commoner *had sooner* and *had as soon*.

Of the existence of "*us was like to go*" there is, to the best of my information, only a possibility. But there is certitude, dating from a long way back, as regards "*we were like to go*,"⁷³ the antecedent of "*we had like to have gone*," a corruption which, it may be,

"*Were not Christ as good have a troubled Church as none at all?*" Anthony Wotton, *An Answer to a Popish Pamphlet*, etc. (1605), p. 59.

"If the Jesuits should prevaile, the poore seculars *were as good to be hanged up together*," etc. Rev. Dr. Thomas James, *The Jesuits Downefall Threatned*, etc. (1612), p. 24.

"*I were as good lie under*," etc. Dr. Donne, *Works* (ed. 1839), vol. I, p. 200.

"*I thinke I had as good Goe with you, as tarrie heere to be hangde*." Anon., *The True Tragedie*, etc. (1595), in *First Sketches*, etc. (1843), p. 169.

And so Dr. South, Bp. Jeremy Taylor, Feltham, Sir Roger L'Estrange, John Wilson, the Rev. Jeremy Collier, Archdeacon Echard, Sir Richard Steele, Garrick, Goldsmith, Lord Chesterfield, etc., etc. Steele puts to after *had as good*.

The following quotation is made, lest it may mislead others, as it might have misled me: "The Pope is labouring it, I know; but *he has as good keep his breath to cool his porridge*." Sir Roger L'Estrange, etc., *Twenty-two Select Colloquies*, etc., p. 287 (ed. 1725). Turning to the edition of 1689, published in Sir Roger's life-time, I find, at p. 271, *had as good*.

Dr. Johnson says: "*Good*, placed after *had*, with *as*, seems a substantive. But the expression is, I think, vicious; and *good* is, rather, an adjective, elliptically used; or it may be considered as adverbial."

There would have been no occasion for anything of this incertitude, if Dr. Johnson had searched English literature as it was his duty to search it.

"*You must give way; and you had as well do so voluntarily, and with a good grace*." Rev. Dr. J. B. Mozley (1844), *Essays Historical and Theological* (1878), vol. II, p. 27.

⁷³"*Hercules . . . was like to have be kyng*." Lydgate, *Tragedies*, etc. (*ut sup.*), fol. 109 v.

"*Now brik . . . forto chyne* [i. e., crack] *is like*." Anon., *Palladius on Husbandrie* (about 1420?), p. 156 (1873).

"*He is like, as y conceive, to have the grete rule yn this mater*." John Shillingford (1447, *ut sup.*), p. 7. And at pp. 9, 10, 11, 16, 38, etc.

"*We are like to be wary*," etc. *Ludus Coventriæ* (*ut sup.*), p. 124. Also at p. 136.

was not developed before the days of Queen Elizabeth.⁷⁴ *Had likely* followed by an infinitive is canvassed in a foot-note.⁷⁵

Different from any of the expressions examined in the preceding pages is *had like*,⁷⁶ *hadst like*, inasmuch as, here, *had* or *hadst* clearly

⁷⁴ "His horse lept, and fell on his knees, and *hadde lyke to have cast hym over his necke.*" William Barkar, *The Bookes of Xenophon*, etc. (1567), sig. C 7 r.

"*I had like to have marde all.*" Rev. Richard Bernard, *Terence*, etc. (*ut sup.*), p. 439.

"*We had like to have had our two noses snapped off.*" Shakespeare, *Much Ado about Nothing*, Act V, Scene I.

"*He had like to have dyed presently after.*" Anon., *The Wonderfull Yeare* (1603), in J. Morgan's *Phoenix Britannicus* (1732), vol. I, p. 47.

"*A raging rabble . . . had like to have left* but small parcels of them untouched and whole." Philemon Holland, *Ammianus Marcellinus* (1609), p. 409.

"*As a theefe, when he is pardoned, lookest backe to the gallowes, or to the halter that had like to hangd him, so lookest shee on her son.*" Rev. Dr. Robert Wilkinson, *A Paire of Sermons*, etc. (1614), p. 11. Here we have the past-participial infinitive, long so common.

Dr. Johnson cites Sir Walter Raleigh for *had like*; and I have quotations for it, which may be spared, from Pepys, Dr. Henry More, Sir Roger L'Estrange, Sir T. P. Blount, Hickes, Collier, De Foe, Roger North, Leonard Welsted, Swift, Dr. Sheridan, Richardson, Goldsmith, Cowper, and Mr. Ruskin.

⁷⁵ John Flamank wrote, about 1503: "I hade no wittnes then but my sylfe; but, as hyt hapned afterwardes, I caused hym, by good crafte, to confesse the same he had said to me be fore hym that was marshell here at that tyme; and, els, I hade lykly to be putt to a grett plunge for my trothe." *Letters, etc., of Richard III and Henry VII* (1861, 1863), vol. I, p. 235.

If explicable with reference to *had liefer*, "I hade lykly," etc., is to be construed: "I should consider as likely my being put," etc. But we here have to do with a sentence belonging to an age when ordinary writers of English dashed down very recklessly what they had to communicate; and Flamank's phrase, in order to warrant any stable philological conclusion, would have to be matched by others.

Henry, Earl of Monmouth, also uses *had likely*. "A very hot skirmish *had likely to have been, had not the King,*" etc. *Compleat History of the Warrs of Flanders* (1654), pp. 274, 275.

Had likely here signifies "was likely." What follows it was to be expected.

⁷⁶ Ignorance has connected the *like* of *had like* with the verb *like*, and has engendered the vulgarism *had liked*, in its stead.

"*I had liked to have begged a parrot for my wife.*" Pepys (1662), *Diary*, etc. (*ut sup.*), vol. II, p. 31.

"*The rabble had lik'd to have pulled him to pieces.*" Mrs. Aphra Behn (died 1689), *Novels* (ed. 1871), vol. I, p. 282.

"*I had formerly the very same [memorial] from himself; and so had the judges, whom he had liked to have provoked by his clownish behaviour at the bar.*" Abp. William Nicolson (1716), in Sir Henry Ellis's *Original Letters*, etc. (*ut sup.*), First Series, vol. III, p. 396.

stands for *was*, *were*, or *wast*. Nor is this all. On looking narrowly at the entire phrase "we had like to have gone,"⁷⁷ who can avoid seeing, in it, a mere monstrosity? To its lawlessness touching *had* it joins free play with *like*, which, by virtue of its context, becomes an adverb; and, besides this, it would convey the idea of indefiniteness of time by the infinitive perfect. Since what is intended by it is, "there was a likelihood of our going,"⁷⁸ it is, if I am not mistaken, a most portentous device. As if after conference, and in concert, the anomaly which it typifies has been eschewed unanimously by the best writers of our century.

Need being, as a neuter verb, one after which, in regimen, *to* may often be forgone, it is not singular that the nominal verb *had need*⁷⁹

"Here I *had liked to have suffered* a second shipwreck." De Foe, *Robinson Crusoe* (*ut sup.*), vol. I, p. 60. See also vol. I, p. 61.

"There is another thing that *had liked to have slipt out of my memory*" Sir C. H. Williams (1741), *Works*, etc. (1822), vol. II, pp. 92, 93.

Only the other day I heard an English gentleman say: "I *had liked to lost* the train." Not a whit more aberrant is the *runned*, for *ran* and *run*, of my humbler neighbours in Suffolk.

⁷⁷ Not of so frequent occurrence, and slightly less objectionable, is "we had like to go."

⁷⁸ The notion seems to me utterly unsustainable, that the expression first meant "we should look on going as likely." At all events, I have chanced on nothing that makes for it in the least.

⁷⁹ Here there is an idiomatic ellipsis of *a*, precisely as there is in *make mention*, *give ear*, etc., etc.

Landor, in one of his Imaginary Conversations, makes Sir Isaac Newton impeach *had need* *have* in a sentence from Lord Bacon: "He that is only real *had need* *have* exceeding great parts of virtue." Dr. Isaac Barrow is feigned to reply: "The true words, which all authors write amiss, are 'ha' need of.' *Ha*' need sounds like *had need*, and *have* sounds like *of*, in speaking quickly. Hence the wisest men have written the words improperly, by writing at once from the ear, without an appeal or reference to grammar." *Works and Life* (*ut sup.*), vol. IV, p. 382.

This is very shallow criticism. As *had need be* must always have been quite as common as *had need have*, if not more so, how would Landor account for its *be*? Again, for several generations after *had need* arose, the verb which it governed was generally introduced by *to*. These considerations cannot have occurred to Landor, who, moreover, nowhere gives token that he had read older English to any mentionable extent, or with any approach to close study. For the rest, it is not irrelevant to note, that, among the predecessors of Bacon who were separated from him by a shorter interval than that between Addison and ourselves, there were those, as I know from several passages, that wrote "have need to mercy," etc., putting *to* for *of*. See the foot of p. 322, *infra*.

Isaac Barrow, as it must strike any one who has observed his English at all scrutinizingly, was whimsically chosen, by Landor, as an exponent of linguistic

should, in like manner, frequently dispense with the sign of the infinitive, as in "we *had need go*."⁸⁰ All that, over and above this, is peculiar about *had need*, consists in its *had*, the vagueness of which, in marking time, is here once more observable.

scrupulosity. *Anthymus for anthems*, *department for departure*, *disingenuity and ingenuity for disingenuousness and ingenuousness*, *overflown for overflowed*, *respective for respectful*, *tenent for tenet*, *inhabitancy*, *a seraphim*, *monstruous*, *stupendious*, *have underwent*, *beseeched*, *blowed*, *catched*, *shaked*, and the verb *critize*, being specimens of what he put forth as English, he would hardly have frowned on *had need have*. Is it, indeed, perfectly certain that he has nowhere used it?

⁸⁰ First I will quote passages in which *to* is expressed.

Five such, ranging from 1465 to 1633, are given in note 39, at p. 298, *supra*.

"And ye purpose to bargayn with hym, ye *had need to hye yow*." John Paston (1472), in the *Paston Letters*, vol. III, p. 34. Also *id.*, *ibid.*, vol. III, pp. 133 (1475?), 143 (1472), 220 (1478), 257 (1479).

"Wherefore ye *had nede to warne* Wylliam Gogyn and hys felaws to purvey them of wyne i now," etc. William Paston (1489), *ibid.*, vol. III, p. 352.

"If my lord send for T. Bange, or the woman, some of my lordis seruauntes *had need to come* for theym." Sir John Paston (1495), *ibid.*, vol. III, p. 390.

"We *had need to take heed*, everywhere, that we be not beguiled with false allegories, . . . Here a man *had need to put on* all his spectacles, and to arm himself against invisible spirits." Tyndale, *Doctrinal Treatises*, etc. (*ut sup.*), p. 425.

"If the kings of the earth, when they break that sacrament between them, do say on this wise, . . . then is it a terrible oath; and they *had need to take heed* how they make it, and, if it be lawfully made, not to break it at all." *Id.*, *Expositions*, etc. (*ut sup.*), p. 301.

"John Baptist said to Christ: 'I *had need to be baptized* of thee; and comest thou to me?' Whereof did John confess that he had need to be washed and purged by Christ?" *Id.*, *An Answer*, etc. (*ut sup.*), pp. 206, 207. Tyndale, in his *New Testament*, has "I *ought to be baptysed*." The authorized version has: "I *have need to be baptized*."

"Who so hath suche bees as your maister in hys head, *Had neede to have* his spirites with musike to be fed." Udall, *Roister Doister*, Act I, Scene IV.

"Liars *had need to have* good memories." Attributed to Bp. Latimer (1556), in Bp. Ridley's *Works* (*ut sup.*), p. 110.

"Alas, they be people rude of their own nature, and the more *had need to be looked to*, for retaining them in quiet and civility." Abp. Parker (1560), *Correspondence* (*ut sup.*), p. 123.

"We *had need to see more*, before we be convicted of corruption." Rev. Dr. William Fulke, *A Defense*, etc. (1583, *ut sup.*), p. 181.

"We see heere a short time limited; and yet wee have a long way to go, even as far as it is from earth to heaven: and *had wee not*, then, *need to pray* to have our life in some measure prolonged?" Rev. Dr. Robert Wilkinson, *A Paire of Sermons*, etc. (1614), pp. 26, 27.

"What though thou art seated in an eminent place, where thou overlookest all! . . . It tells thee thou *hadst need to looke* about thee. What place left for retired thoughts?" Rev. Thomas Ailesbury, *A Sermon*, etc. (1623), p. 45.

Upwards of five and twenty years have passed since I committed to paper the substance of the essay now laid before the public. Wider reading, or more attentive, would, I am convinced, have enabled me to support my arguments by an ampler exhibition of

"And the best *had need to be* carefull to keep themselves awake; or els this sleep will seize upon them." Rev. Daniel Dent, *A Sermon against Drunkennes* (1628), p. 12.

"Our houre runnes apace: wee *had need to worke* hard." Rev. George Hughes, *The Saints Losse and Lamentation* (1632), pp. 53, 54.

"Seeing, then, that truth consisteth in the right ordering of names in our affirmations, a man that seeketh precise truth *had need to remember* what every name he uses stands for," etc. Hobbes, *Leviathan*, p. 15 (ed. 1651).

"When I have most freedom, I shall most suspect my self. He that is turn'd into the sea *had need to look* to have his pilot along." Feltham, *Resolves*, etc., p. 200 (ed. 1696).

And so I might go on indefinitely. Even in our own age, instances like the foregoing are not unknown.

"The Petersburg telegrapher . . . *had need to be* a strong hand, if he is to be permanently telegraphing to us about places and things between Russia and India" Viscount Strangford (1868), *A Selection*, etc., vol. II, p. 233.

"If the bad-tempered man wants to apologize, he *had need to do* it on a large public scale," etc. "George Eliot," *Impressions of Theophrastus Such*, p. 129 (ed. 1879).

But, from the very first, not improbably, *to* was optionally dropped after *had need*.

"But and it lyke you to take the worship upon you, ye *had nede highe* you to London, Nevertheless, if ye be dysposed, ye *had nede send* a man by fore, in all hast, that no thing be to seke." Thomas Playter (1461), in the *Paston Letters*, vol. II, pp. 13, 14.

A vast collection of extracts which I have got together brings out the fact, that the phrase in question enjoyed marked acceptance all through the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Divines, historians, and dramatists alike favoured it, both then and afterwards. Sir Th. Wilson, Bp. Aylmer, Dr. Th. Lodge, Shakespeare, Donne, Ben Jonson, Bp. Jos. Hall, Prynne, the Rev. Edmund Calamy, Bp. Taylor, the Rev. Jasper Mayne, Bp. John Gauden, Sir Roger L'Estrange, Archdeacon Echard, Swift, and a hundred other well-known writers, have admitted it to their pages. Cowper has it again and again: so has "George Eliot": and who has not heard it from the best speakers of English? Yet one can learn little or nothing of all this from the makers of our dictionaries and grammars.

Near the beginning of this note, Tyndale is quoted, more than once, for the quasi-aoristic *had heed* followed by an infinitive. What is still more noticeable is his aoristic *had need of*.

"And, after the same manner, though our popish hypocrites succeed Christ and his apostles, and have their scripture, yet they be fallen from the faith and living of them, and are heretics, and *had need of* a John Baptist to convert them." *An Answer*, etc. (*ut sup.*), p. 45.

Similarly, as the context shows, writes the Rev. Dr. William Fulke: "We *had need of* a better demonstration than the former, by which you yourselves are proved heretics, rather than we." *A Defense*, etc. (1583, *ut sup.*), pp. 36, 37.

usage than, under existing circumstances, is practicable. And yet I cannot help believing that the evidentiary quotations which it has been in my power to produce will be acknowledged, by all but unreasonable cavillers, to substantiate the conclusions here referred to the judgment of scholars.

FITZEDWARD HALL.

"A man wronged *had need* of a more noble hart to forgive his enimie, than to be revenged of him and to kill him." T. B., *The French Academie* (1586, *ut sup.*), p. 360. Also at pp. 124, 165.

And so Bp. Joseph Hall (1604): "Worldly pleasures, like physicians, give us over, when once we lie a dying: and yet the death-bed *had* most *need* of comforts." *Works*, p. 21 (ed. 1648).

Likewise, in 1609: "If there be any opinions whose mention confutes them, these are they. None can bee more vaine; none *had* more *need* of solidity." *Ibid.*, p. 397.

The convertibility of *had need* and *have need* is seen from Tyndale's *had need to be baptized*, spoken of above, and the *have need to be baptized* of the received translation of the New Testament. And here are other passages testifying to their former identity of meaning.

"George . . . They have bene up this two daies. *Nicke*. Then they *had* more *need* to go to bed now." Anon., *The First Part of the Contention*, etc. (1594), in *The First Sketches*, etc. (1843), p. 50.

"George . . . They have been up these two days. *John*. They *have* the more *need* to sleep now, then." *Second Part of King Henry VI*, Act IV, Scene II. Just after occurs "so he *had need*," aoristic.

For *had need to*, aoristic, not followed by a verb, see the second quotation in note 65, at p. 313, *supra*, where *thou* precedes it. *Have need*, as ordinarily employed, but with *to* or *unto* and an accusative case, is used by John Paston (1469 and 1472), in the *Paston Letters*, vol. II, p. 343, and vol. III, p. 46; and it occurs in the anonymous *Cronycle of Englonde* (1483, *ut sup.*), sig. P 1 r.

Of such phraseology as *have need be* I am aware of but two instances.

"Ye *have* nede fare fayre with hym; for he ys full daungerouse, when he wille." William Worcester (1456), in the *Paston Letters*, vol. I, p. 375.

"All men, therefore, . . . *have need be taught* to distinguish well between what is and what is not necessary to eternall salvation." Hobbes, *Leviathan*, p. 321 (ed. 1651).

In older English, an unwarrantable *th* is often seen, where we write *d* or *dd*; witness *hundreth*, *lather*, *meath*, *murther*, *ruther*. On the other hand, the etymological *d* or *dh* of many words has been changed to *th*; and the medieval *fader*, *fuder*, *gader*, *hider*, *ledder*, *moder*, *oder*, *tedder*, and *thider* were slow in yielding to the present *father*, *further*, *gather*, *hither*, *leather*, etc. At the time when *th* and *d* were largely interchangeable, *had* was now and then put for *hath*, singular and plural, at least when written. In case this spelling was not from carelessness, but represented actual pronunciation, "he, you, etc., *had* need" was, at first, nothing but a variation of "he, you, etc., *hath* need." On this theory,—one which I set little by,—there is a difficulty about "*I had* need," though *I hath* is not unknown; but it may have been a corruption induced by an aim at uniformity. "*Thou had* need" I have not fallen in with, except in the passage lately referred to.

II.—THE VENDIDÂD AS TRANSLATED BY M. DARMESTETER.

The fourth volume of Max Müller's edition of the Sacred Books of the East contains part of M. Darmesteter's English translation of the Zend-Avesta, namely, the Vendidâd, prefaced by a general introduction to the work. The Vendidâd is not, perhaps, the book of the Avesta to which the student of religions attaches most value; but the variety of its contents makes it the most explicit, though not most reliable, witness to the facts and drift of Mazdeism. It is composed chiefly of details, as tedious as they are minute, respecting the ceremonial of purification, a matter of great moment to the Mazdean, on whose timorous faith the contact of the world entailed a perpetual peril of pollution; but breaking in upon this theme, and otherwise not closely connected with it, are found various fragments of an interesting nature, as, for instance, the geographical data of the 1st Fargard, the legend of Yima and of the deluge (II), the almost epic narrative of Zoroaster's contest with Ahriman (XIX), some snatches of poetical strains (III), and, besides, many passages which arrest the attention by the light they cast on the private life and social habits of the early Iranians (VII, XII, XVIII, etc.). These episodes are certainly better calculated than the sober fervor of the old hymns to win favor with the public at large; and if it was any part of M. Darmesteter's plan to reach this wider circle, we must admit that no translation is better qualified than his to accomplish this result. Anquetil-Duperron's version, which once embodied all that European scholarship knew of the Avesta, seems to us of to-day written in an unintelligible jargon; Spiegel's version, which was published nearly twenty years ago and supplanted Anquetil's, and that which an eminent Belgian scholar, M. de Harlez, has just given to the public in a very complete work on the Avesta, are by no means deficient in qualities of style, yet their scrupulous literalness betrays the scientific preoccupations of their authors to a much greater degree than M. Darmesteter's. In truth, no Zend scholar excels M. Darmesteter in the art of bringing out the salient features of the text, and of lending to the awkward and involved diction of the

original the order and elegance of modern writing. Fully to appreciate this merit, one must pick out in Spiegel's version one of the many passages which stand there like algebraic equations bristling with unknown quantities, and then suddenly turn to the almost transparent clearness of the same passage in M. Darmesteter's rendering (conf. I, 53-58; III, 44-72, etc.). To be sure, recent labors have done away with the opinion, current in a period not far remote, that the Mazdean writers thought and composed by fits and starts and according to mental processes unheard of among other Indo-European nations; but the literary features of M. Darmesteter's work go even beyond the simple requirements of a version. One might almost suggest that the studied simplicity and regular rhythm of his sentences cast too uniform a drapery over a book which is marked by great unevenness, and that his seldom dimmed clearness disguises failings of the text too obvious to be forgotten; and yet no one could earnestly take M. Darmesteter to task for being, in point of mental resources and style, better equipped than his originals.

These, however, and other equally attractive features, are but the outward merits of the work; the inner worth is that with which we have to do. Indeed, the more popular a work of this kind promises to be, the more deeply it ought to be searched by all interested in the texts. Translations, above all translations of the Avesta, are long-lived. The errors they may convey are not so easily eradicated as spread, and may prejudice not only the studies immediately depending on them, but also the drift of public opinion. Not to go very far, Mr. J. Fiske, in a recent article in the Atlantic Monthly, quoted the opening verses of the Vendidâd in Spiegel's version, apparently unconscious that it is now seventeen years since the German scholar recanted that rendering in his Commentary.

The simplest way to bring to light the merits or failings of a translation is, usually, to compare it with others. This proceeding is open in the present case to an objection. It might be curious and often amusing to point out the discrepancies between Spiegel's version, for example, and M. Darmesteter's, but it would be also unfair to the older scholar. In so new a science as ours, a score of years tells heavily on books. Spiegel's work appears to us strewn with errors for the same reason that a newly cleared field is dotted with stumps, and we must not forget that the clearing itself was no small task. Besides, Spiegel has modified his view in many points in his Commentary. With more recent versions the case is differ-

ent; and I might find here a fit occasion to do justice to the meritorious labors of M. de Harlez¹ and to the spirited renderings of Geldner in Kuhn's *Zeitschrift*; but in reality we have to deal with something more than a question of relative merit, for problems of scientific import are involved in comparison with which clearness and force are of little moment. The interpretation of the *Avesta* is still made up, in great part, of suggestions which science slowly corroborates or invalidates, and in a science of promises it is not so much the results we must consider as the promises themselves and the guarantees behind them; in other words, the methods used by the translators are even more important than the translations. In respect to this point M. Darmesteter's ready pen has much facilitated the task. The scope of his work did not allow him room for justificatory notes, but this lack is amply made up by the outspokenness of his *Introduction*, where we find not only very direct information touching his method, but the many axioms, suggestions, theories of large or small compass, which constitute the writer's convictions on the subject of Mazdeism. These theories are woven with the translation itself into so ingenious and close a fabric that it would be impossible to disentwine them, and his introductory statements must come in for as large a share in my criticisms as his translation. I might add, in a spirit of fairness, that though M. Darmesteter's statements are clothed with an absoluteness which courts opposition, his presentation of them is neither aggressive nor disparaging to other views, and that while endeavoring to give my objections all the force of which they are susceptible, I do not impugn his talents and the right a scholar has to convictions of his own.

Preliminarily and to clear off the ground, as it were, I wish to mention one of M. Darmesteter's surmises concerning the age of the *Avesta*. There can be no absolute objection to our believing with him, *a priori*, that although the *Avesta* is pre-Sassanian, some parts of it may have been written by the editors, that is as late as the IVth century of our era. The fact that this opinion opens a vast field of new conjectures is not, of course, an adverse proof. Nor is the fact that the Pahlavi version dates from that time an insuperable objection, though it is more plausible to admit a considerable

¹ The revised edition of this scholar's work reached me too late to be used extensively in this criticism. Besides it is too important a work to serve merely as a foil.

interval between the closing of the Mazdean books and the wants which brought forth the Pahlavi version and Commentaries. What is worth noticing is the evidence adduced. The argument is based on an axiom, a form of speech too much favored, perhaps, in this Introduction. "The ability to translate a dead language," he says (p. xxxvii), "is a good test of the ability to write in it," etc.; that is to say, since the editors knew how to edit the Avesta they knew how to write Zend and may have written Zend. This, however, is too quick a gait for us; for, as to those editors and first translators, it is believed by some that, let alone writing, they did not know how to read the Avesta, that they had lost the key to the grammar if not to the sense of their books and translated according to transmitted data. I venture then to say that this argument is forestalling a question which must be solved by something more than axiomatic maxims. From the hypothesis that they may have written to the statement that they did write, there is, as one might expect, a short step. M. Darmesteter alleges two passages as showing traces of a very late composition: the first in F. XVIII, 10, where Ahura Mazda speaks of the sham priest of the Mazdean faith: 'He who should set that man at liberty when bound in prison does no better deed than if he should flay a man alive,' etc. This anathema, M. Darmesteter comments, indicates a time when Mazdeism was a state religion and had to fight against heresy; it must therefore belong to Sassanian times. What impairs this reasoning is that the word *azō* rendered by 'prison,' means simply 'distress,' and the word rendered 'liberty' may mean 'cheer.' Indeed, these are the meanings he gives both words, respectively, in a verse preceding almost immediately the one in question, so that this passage, of his own showing, must mean: 'He who should bring that man from distress to joy does no better deed than if he flayed a man alive,' etc., a sense which is so tame that we should scruple to accept it even had we not another and better one to offer, namely: 'If he (the sham priest) should bring a man of mine (a believer) from distress to joy, he would do him no more good than if he should flay him alive,' etc., which amounts to saying that the benefit conferred by a false priest turns to evil.

It is likewise Ahura-Mazda who speaks in the second passage, F. IV, 46, seq.: 'Verily I say unto thee, O Spitama Zarathustra! the man who has a wife is far above him who begets no sons; he who keeps a house is far above him who has none; he who has children is far above the childless man; he who has riches is far above him who has none; and of two men, he who fills

himself with meat is filled with the good spirit much more than he who does not so,' etc. This passage also is susceptible of another rendering, but for the sake of brevity I will let it stand, and pass to M. Darmesteter's comments. 'We find in this passage,' he says, 'an illustration from the Avesta itself of the celebrated doctrines of the three seals with which Manî had sealed the bosom, the hand and the mouth of his disciples' (xli). M. Darmesteter himself weakens the force of his ingenious suggestion by quoting in the foot-note (p. 46) the remark made by Herodotus eight centuries before Manî, that 'in Persia there are prizes given by the king to those who have most children.' It does not seem to us, however, that the correspondence between the two injunctions is as salient as our writer's words purport; it is still less apparent in Haug's and de Harlez's versions, and disappears entirely in the rendering, for us preferable to all others, outlined by Spiegel, so that M. Darmesteter's statement rests solely on M. Darmesteter's translation. We find a similar and clearer injunction in F. III, 33, there in its right connection, in the midst of a praise of agriculture, which a sort of metrical movement and rhyme mark out as belonging to the older strata of the Vendidâd: 'No one who does not eat has strength to do works of holiness, strength to do works of husbandry, strength to beget children.' Here the precept assumes the numeric form of the Manichean formula; but, at the same time, the internal coincidence fades away, which explains, perhaps, why our writer did not quote this wording. In reality, both the context and the passages bring to mind a doctrine more general and also more directly adverse to the favorite maxims of Mazdeism, namely, asceticism. In enjoining the pursuit of agriculture and cattle-raising as a holy work, the early books gave the note which was to be echoed by all following generations. It is not necessary to descend as far as the 3d or 4th century of our era to explain a conflict which must have risen repeatedly between Mazdean thrift, hallowed by the highest warrant, and the ascetic doctrines which spread so early over the East. A contemplative life must have been looked on by the believer as not only idle but impious. Which peculiar sect is meant is not a problem to be solved easily, yet I cannot but notice the words immediately preceding the passage quoted from F. IV. M. Darmesteter translates: 'Before the water and the blazing fire, let no one make bold to deny having received from his neighbor the ox or the garment' . . . , which is not only marked

doubtful in the foot-note, but is also out of all connection with the context. As none of the several suggestions offered is more appropriate than this, I venture my own surmise: the word *aiwyō* instead of the dative plural of *ap*, 'water,' may be the same case of the demonstrative *aēm*, and the passage may mean: 'They have so stated in regard to the men *taptibyō* (or *taptalēbyō*) that one should not preach the renouncement to husbandry and cattle-tending.' This would be a becoming introduction to a praise of these occupations, and, at the same time, an allusion to some ascetic sect that had found its way from India to Iran and propagated the peculiar observances understood there under the name *tapas*. This rendering offers syntactical difficulties of its own, and, besides, so definite a clue ought not to be accepted too lightly; yet when a path has led so many away from the goal, it is but fit that a new one should be struck out.

Testimony which proves so refractory to M. Darmesteter's views cannot have imposed itself upon him; he must have sought for it. Indeed, the trained hand of the lawyer may be seen behind the depositions of the witnesses. If one asks what the point at stake is, I see but one possible answer: Decide that the editors knew how to write Zend and wrote part of the Avesta, and the question so momentous in Zend studies as to the value of native and traditional learning takes at once a new and unexpected turn.

The controversy bearing upon the relative worth of tradition and comparative philology in the interpretation of the texts is not due to the hasty temper of the controversialists, as one might think who had heard the clash of Zend polemics, but to the peculiar conditions under which our studies were born. The language of the Avesta was dead in a much deeper sense than the word ever had in regard to Sanskrit, and its deciphering almost entirely dependent on outer help. The first investigators, without puzzling themselves with hair-splitting distinctions of priority, laid their hands on all that was tributary to their object. They were as prompt to accept the data of native tradition as to welcome the method of comparison as soon as discovered; yet it was evident that as the latter was improving in accuracy and getting a keen edge, it would gradually push to the first place, and drive the other auxiliaries from the field after they had yielded their harvest. The conflict was precipitated by the impetuous personality of Haug, as much perhaps by his aggressive attitude in regard to prior researches as by the too absolute authority

he gave to the Vedas in purely Avestic matters. The failings of Haug's work and his ultimate adherence to Parsee tradition in its narrowest form show that he was hardly prepared to lead the movement which he initiated; yet, though by his aggression he forced several Zend scholars of high repute to accentuate the value of traditional help more than had previously occurred to them, he also brought others to realize the importance of his suggestions, and thus gave the study a new momentum. Since his death the controversy to which he was a party has lost much of its bitterness, and is chiefly evinced in the remarkable care which recent authors take to define their attitude accurately, and the efforts of some to bring tradition and comparison to pull together in the same harness. As for M. Darmesteter, no one could ride two horses more dexterously if we were to take his statements at a glance (Introd., p. xxviii). 'The Vedas,'—and by 'Vedas' he characterizes here and elsewhere the comparative method—'the Vedas,' he says, 'generally speaking, cannot help to discover matters of fact in the Avesta, but only to explain them when discovered by tradition . . . ; tradition gives the materials and comparison puts them in order; it is not possible to know the Avesta without the former or to understand it without the latter.' Nothing, indeed, could be more equitable. Only one might object that the writer is so intent on doing justice to the two witnesses that he forgets the real party in court, namely the Avesta itself, for fear, perhaps, that being called upon to testify it might incriminate itself. It would have impaired the brief elegance of his statement, but not its completeness, to say that there have been, and are yet, several scholars at work on the arduous task of eliciting, partly from outside comparison, but at this stage from the texts themselves, a grammar, a syntax, and a system of phonetics, which will not owe to the Vedas much more than the Vedas owe to other branches of the Indo-European family of languages. Still we must not lay to his unwillingness that which is due to the epigrammatic brevity of his style, but rather look for the sober meaning of his statement. What are the 'materials' that we are to accept from the tradition? Is it the lexicography? One would scarcely think so after reading the foot-note which he subjoins to his rendering of F. III, 31: "The translation 'acts of adoration and oblations' (of which he made use in the verse indicated) is doubtful; the words in the text are $\ddot{\alpha}\pi\alpha\ddot{\xi}$ $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\acute{\omega}\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha$, which are traditionally translated by 'feet and breast,'" etc. If we add to this instance the many words marked

doubtful in his notes, which are only the cases in which he was willing to impeach his own work, the evident pains at which he has been to reconcile the Pahlavi and the text, we will be forced to the belief, which we might have expressed *a priori*, that the tradition consisted of a certain rendering which was given and transmitted in the bulk, but which the teachers were often at a loss to adapt closely to the individual forms and words. There would be, for all that, little danger in admitting the help of Pahlavi lexicographers. As long as the sense of a word must pass through the double crucible of comparative etymology and adaptation to the text, there can be little harm done, if also little help given, that way. If, however, by 'materials,' M. Darmesteter means,—and everything tends to prove that this is his meaning,—to accept the concrete sense, the sense in the rough, of the tradition, and to give to a certain rendering a privileged position at the gates of the Mazdean Scriptures, then we must confess our sincere disappointment. Nor is this feeling allayed by M. Darmesteter's comforting assurance that 'the more one enters into the meaning of the text, the fuller justice is done to the merits of the Pahlavi translation,' for, if it proves anything, it proves that he has deferred a little more than his predecessors to the model before him. I will not repeat all that has been said about the untrustworthiness of that translation and the low plane on which the native interpreters were placed in regard to their own books; I claim that we may and must decline such an exclusive privilege in favor of any one translation, no matter what the dialect or the age, on the plea of individual responsibility and scientific independence. The texts are placed before us not that we may see how far they agree with the Mazdeans of the IVth or Vth century of our era, but that we may, spontaneously and in all integrity, elicit their meaning. If the texts cannot be made to speak in their own behalf, if the key to them is mislaid, then let us forfeit, temporarily, all claims to having knowledge of the Avesta itself, and give all our efforts to the patient labor of deciphering these hieroglyphs. But, indeed, philology has furnished us with a grammar, the agreement of tradition with etymology has given us a partial lexicon, and it remains for individual scholars to do the rest, complete the lexicography and wrestle with the text. The Avesta has or ought to have outgrown the tutelage of tradition.

Is it possible to elicit any sense without starting from the traditional data? It would seem, on reading M. Darmesteter's Introduction, that there is no method but his. He draws, it is true,

the extravagant outlines of a nondescript which he calls 'comparative method.' The name I know, but I do not recognize the traits. I will gladly join him in condemning the view, if it now exists, that 'the Avesta and the Vedas are two echoes of one and the same thought,' and that 'the Vedas are both the best lexicon and the best commentary to the Avesta'; but, this done, I ask again: Is there not another and more sensible method? Many will think with me that there is one which aims at finding the meaning of a word by following its history in an ascending march, and might therefore be named 'comparative etymology' in contradistinction to unqualified 'comparison,' which seems to imply for M. Darmesteter a wholesale use of Vedic texts and a forced assimilation of forms, phrases and ideas.' This method is identified with Vedic studies in so much only that early Sanskrit offers the first and nearest relay in the search, and that we find there, steeped in light, words and forms which bear to the words and forms of the Avesta a likeness oftentimes amounting to identity. Likeness of form,—let us bear this in mind, and not forget that phonetic identity, even when absolute, is no voucher for identity of meaning, and that, in religious nomenclatures especially, outward analogy weighs next to nothing in regard of the inner worth of words. Haug's unsuccessful attempt to graft Zend studies on Sanskrit lexicography ought to be a warning, if simple common sense did not teach as much. As M. Darmesteter says, the Vedas cannot give us the sense of a Zend word; but, though he does not say so, they give us that which in respect to verbs is decisive for the sense also, a sure clue to the root, and part of the history, of a word. I will readily admit that after a word is traced to its root, its sense is often left as vague as that of the root itself; but the work of the etymologist does not end there. He has before him the task of specifying and individualizing the general sense by the immediate context, and by comparison with other passages and with other forms of the same root, whether in the Avesta or in kindred languages, and finally, with the data of tradition which may confirm or modify his results or give him new clues. The best proof that comparative etymology does not 'move in a vacuum and build up a fanciful language' is the fact that it sometimes confirms the traditional sense and oftener corrects it; indeed, it is this confirmation which saves M. Darmesteter's work from being placed on the low level of Pahlavi glosses and gives it a modern value. If the testimony of comparison is acceptable when it confirms—and here correction is another sort of confirmation—it ought to bear the same force when it utterly con-

demns, that is to say, it is the first and last resort. It is true, nevertheless, that, though the ascending part of the process is relatively easy, the work of individualizing the sense is liable to arbitrariness. As an illustration to the point I will adduce the rendering of v. 46 in F. XIII. After a somewhat humorous comparison of the dog with a priest, a warrior and a husbandman, successively, the writer likens him to a *vaēgu*. The stem of this word is speedily traced back to *viç*, 'house' or 'village,' but not so the final stamp which is to give it its individual and local value as a word. Is it 'villager,' or 'servant,' or 'neighbor'? The context gives little help, for, apart from the divergent readings of the manuscripts, the succeeding words are as many puzzles. M. Darmesteter, walking in the steps of tradition, keeps clear of these hindrances, translates *vaēgu* 'strolling singer,' and renders thus smoothly: 'The dog is like a strolling singer, he is intrusive like a strolling singer, he is meagre like a strolling singer, he is poor like a strolling singer,' etc., which is certainly a faithful description of certain musicians of our days, and may have been of the Iranian minstrels, if such a class existed, for we have nothing but the opinion of a late commentator for that sense, and whatever force there is in etymology against it. Both Spiegel and de Harlez looked to etymology for the sense of the main word, but it is best for my purpose to bring in Geldner's rendering, which rests on the sole basis of comparison: 'The dog is like a servant, he welcomes like a servant, he devours what is within his reach like a servant, he eats in the rear of the house like a servant, (he only eats three times a day) like a servant,' etc. This sense may not be better, *in se*, than the tradition's, though, if there were strolling minstrels in those days, there may also have been in Iranian houses servants' halls where dogs and menials alike were fed; but the process through which Geldner arrives at this bit of domestic information is open to strong objections. First, he selects the easiest, and not the most accredited reading (*zairimyaçma* instead of *zairimyafçma*), a procedure not countenanced by the best exegetical methods; and, secondly, he looks for the specialization of the words, not to evidence handed by the Avesta, but by Sanskrit; the word *zairimya*, if his etymological clue is correct, cannot have another meaning except that obtained by a comparison of the radical sense and of kindred Zend words, namely 'heat' or possibly 'fire-place.'¹

¹ I surmise that the sentence means: 'like a servant he takes his abode by the fire-place,' but the discussion of *afçma* or *fçma* would take us too far out of our way.

For all that, Geldner's efforts seem to me to be in the right direction. They are certainly in keeping with this elementary postulate of exegesis that words must be allowed to speak for themselves. The etymological method has failings of its own, not counting the too great weight allotted to Vedic analogues. It will be a hopeless task to harmonize any two renderings as long as one can choose arbitrarily between the many and contradictory readings offered by the manuscripts; and comparative science will fall very short of its aims, unless it be accompanied by a never-relenting scrutiny of the texts, forms and phonetic phenomena of the Avesta; but this very condition imposed upon the comparative method is also the most trusty guarantee we have that Zend studies will thrive by it.

Coming back to M. Darmesteter's own method, it is fair to say that in a passage of his Introduction (c) he avers that it rests on the Parsee tradition, 'corrected or confirmed by the comparative method.' This addition does not quite meet the case, for, even should the supplementary work confirm the first, the outcome would be no better than the Avesta rendered on the low and narrow plane of a late commentator. Still the corrective is excellent, and in hands determined to apply it most rigorously might lead to positive independence. Let us examine, then, how it has served our translator, and first, mark the peril. We all know how easy it is to make a preconceived theory agree with the facts in hand; the malleability of facts is, indeed, one of the most insidious perils that science encounters on the part of theories and theorists, and I suppose that every one has had to fight against the inner and often unavowed predilections which impair the judgment and forestall the verdict. Now, words are hardly less pliable than facts, and, in interpretation, the surest way to find a certain sense is to keep it before one's eyes, the more so if the text is in the nature of things both loose and obscure. A gentle pressure, a turn of the hand, as it were, and the text will revolve as easily as a table under spiritualistic touch. I will take as an instance the opening verses of the 1st Fargard. Tradition commented upon it in a vague and unsatisfactory manner, namely, that 'where a man is born there he sees most charms,' which is a rather singular preface to this important chapter. And this is the way M. Darmesteter worked the comment into the text: 'Ahura Mazda spake unto Spitama Zarathustra, saying: I have made every land dear to its dwellers, even though it had no charms in it: had I not made every land dear to its dwellers, even though

it had no charms whatever in it, then the whole living world would have invaded the Airyano Vaējō.' This is certainly logical; one could not be more provident and ingenious than Ahura Mazda, nor think more like a philosophizing scholiast. When we come to the text, however, the fitness disappears; this opening opens to nothing, for no further mention is made of the love of country or its effects. One fails to see the 'every' of the rendering; then 'rāmōdāitīm,' to favor the scholiast, is translated 'dear to its dwellers,' which is an approach to the etymological sense and against the Zend tradition, while 'shāitīm,' for the same reason, is made to mean 'charms,' in agreement with the tradition and against etymology. There is no method in all this unless adhesion to native brooding be taken for one. Construing the passage as M. Darmesteter does, but keeping close to the data of comparison, one finds that it reads thus: 'I made fit to dwell in land that was in no way inhabitable: had I not made fit to dwell in land that was in no way habitable, the whole living world had invaded the Airyana Vaējō'; and the writer proceeds to enumerate the places thus made habitable, beginning for the sake of completeness with the Airyana Vaējō, the cradle of the Aryans, though this, in the Avesta at large as well as in the verse just quoted, is spoken of as anterior to the settlements of the Iranians, and legendary more than historical.

Of this tendency to subject the texts to a gentle traction in order to render their testimony more telling, we have already given examples, and shall have to give more. But this is not the only peril. If, as suggested previously, the transmitted sense were 'in the rough,' it might not always adapt itself to the text. Now there are instances where the text seems faulty. This is not due entirely to the copyist. In many cases it is owing to the absence of precise rules among the writers of the Avesta, though there reigns a certain method even in the midst of that confusion, as Spiegel and after him Hübschmann have judiciously observed. If, however, in the case of a conflict between the text and the tradition, the adept of the latter is tempted to justify his guide at the cost of the scribe, he has in his position a ready excuse, and therefore an inducement to take the step. This is a reproach which it were unjust to cast upon the traditional method as such. It touches all who give their first allegiance, not to the Avesta, but to some source or theory outside of it. Geldner, for instance, on the plea of metrical fitness, takes liberties with the originals which his learning can palliate but not excuse, while nothing speaks more in

favor of the version of M. de Harlez, himself a moderate partisan of tradition, than his unalloyed respect for the texts he translates. The following striking example will prove that my imputation is not unfounded in respect to our version: In F. III there is an almost lyrical moment as the writer eloquently recites the advantages of husbandry. In the midst of the strain, however, there is a passage the general drift of which is clear, but which is impaired by nearly every translator's trying to make it as figurative as possible, forgetting that the lyricism of the Mazdean must not be relied on for drawing a long breath. Here is M. Darmesteter's translation: 'He who would till the earth, O Spitama Zarathustra, with the left arm and with the right, with the right arm and with the left, unto him will she bring forth plenty, like a loving bride on her bed, unto her beloved; the bride will bring forth children, the earth will bring forth plenty of fruit!' The elegant symmetry of this passage would do honor to the taste of the original writer. Unluckily it is not the loving bride who is abed, but the bridegroom, at least the word is unmistakably masculine in form. A strict adherence to the text gives a meaning less brilliant but more in keeping with Mazdean soberness: 'He who would till the earth with the left arm and with the right . . . to him, reclining on his bespread seat, she will, as friend to friend, bring for his enjoyment her progeny and array.' This last rendering agrees in the main with both de Harlez's and Geldner's; it differs from them chiefly by taking 'friend to friend' as an adverbial phrase; those words were current as early as in the Gâthâs and seem quoted here irrespective of gender.

The illustrations we have just given concern minor points, and betray a bias rather than an offensive misapprehension of the text. In truth, I believe that the Vendidâd suffers less than other books would suffer by being rendered according to tradition, for it was more on a level with the plane of the religious views and, probably also, of the linguistic knowledge of the Pahlavi translators. Moreover, the fact that the results of both methods have come even to a distant agreement gives us a tolerable certainty that we know the drift of the book. For all that, Zend studies have not attained that point when scholarship becomes an ingenious and delicate exercise of the mind. There is a certain indomitable energy wanted in the first age of a science as well as in the early settlement of a country. To confine exegetical science, at this stage, to confirming or correcting anterior data would leave out the possibility of striking out a new

path and rejecting absolutely current errors. We find occasionally passages traditionally very clear, but of such clearness as makes us wish for the obscurity that would challenge elucidation. The lives of Zoroaster, for instance, usually begin with the statement that he was the son of Pourushaçpa, and born 'near the river Dareja on a high mountain,' in spite of the obvious impossibility of dwelling at the same time on the mountain above and by the river below. On inquiry we find that this last particular is borrowed from F. XIX, 4, 10. When we ask the interpreters to locate either river or mountain they plead ignorance and address us to the Bundeheš; but were the Bundeheš writer at hand, his answer to the same query would not unlikely sound like this: 'Of that river, or mountain, I have no personal knowledge, as is proved by my text, but you will find it in F. XIX of the Vendidād.' The word *darejya* which is at issue may certainly happen to be the name of a river, though the simple voucher of tradition does not carry much weight with all. It may also have happened that the native interpreters, nonplused by an unknown word, turned it as a last resort into a proper name, a surmise which is not a little strengthened by the fact that they recurred to the same summary process when they reached the following and equally puzzling word, *paitizbarahi*, in which some commentators see the name of a mountain, 'Zbar.' The question is further entangled by the reappearance of those two words in a subsequent verse (XIX, 11), though there, as I think, out of their connection, and possibly by a blunder of the editors. Comparative etymology had surely never come to those geographical notions of itself. Indeed, Spiegel and Windischmann as well as Haug, in various ways and with the help of comparison, sought for, and obtained, renderings widely diverging from the traditional one, though not very apposite. That was in the early days of Zend studies. Another curious fact is that all three of them, from sheer lassitude perhaps, gave up the task, the former two returning to the rendering, or rather non-rendering of the native school, while Haug struck out a new and far less inviting path. Here is the traditional version in Spiegel's final wording. Zarathustra, beset by the evil Druj, advances, holding in his hands stones of the size of a house (according to tradition), and Ahura Mazda addresses him thus: 'Where wilt thou hold them (the stones) on this earth, the broad, round one, of distant travel? by the Dreji of the Zbar, by Pourushaçpa's dwelling.' This left room for a better version, and M. Darmesteter, who has worked so many wonders in favor of



tradition, might have performed one this time in behalf of the Vendidâd, but he preferred to abide by, and smooth over, the unmeaning material of his model. Despite his efforts, however, nothing will assuage the exquisite absurdity of his rendering: For him it is Ahriman who speaks: 'At what on this wide, round earth, whose ends lie afar, at what dost thou swing (those stones), thou who standest by the river Dareja, upon the mountains, in the mansion of Pourushaçpa ?'

This absurdity is not a slip; it seems on the contrary to be skillfully contrived to confirm the sense which his version of the whole passage tends to make out, namely, that Zoroaster is a god of light, and the river, mountain, mansion, are figures pertaining by right to the abode of the god, the heavens. The fate of M. Darmesteter's theories, however, ought not to weigh against the simple dictate of science, which is to suppose sense, not nonsense, in the texts. If there is in the Vendidâd any evidence that the common rules of logic and clearness were observed by its writers, we must reject any rendering that sins so grossly against both, and look for new clues. We might find them among those rejected too easily, after being taken up hastily by former scholars. Haug's first view that the word rendered 'mountain' (*paitizbarahi*) is a verb seems to be borne out by the symmetry of the passage and the identity of form with the preceding verb (*drazhahi*), and, if it be a verb, the word rendered by a name of river is simply an adverb or a noun in an oblique case. The etymological clue proposed by Haug (*paitizbar* = *pratihvar*) leads to nothing and must be rejected. This done, and these premises being acted upon anew, I hope that sooner or later a sense will be found that will meet the wants of both the text and logic. Pointing out the failures of many eminent scholars makes it presumptuous for me to offer my own rendering, yet this much can be surmised. If Westergaard's reading (*vandemnō*) is adopted for the clause immediately preceding, then our verse contains the tenor of Zoroaster's invocation to Mazda, which itself may be outlined thus: 'Where art thou who holdest him (Ahriman) fast on this earth, the much travelled, round, wide-reaching one, and defendest with might the house of Pourushaçpa ?' (*zbarahi* I take to be connected with *spar*, to fight, in Zend *zpar* or *zbar*).

This adaptation on M. Darmesteter's part to the tameness of native comments is not owing to a lack of scientific boldness; only his energy has found its way into other channels than the slow

processes of comparative etymology. There is, in fact, in his version another feature than the traditional leaning, one which gives it a peculiar place in Zend studies. We mentioned at the outset the singular allotment made to tradition and the Vedas respectively: the former is to give us the materials, the latter the 'understanding' of the Avesta. One might object that going to the Vedas seems a long journey out, that we have the best sense of the Avesta in the older books, that sober reason recommends the interpretation of a religious book by the spirit of the religion itself, and, finally, that exotic light should not be let in until all the light within has proved insufficient. If all this, or part of this, occurred to M. Darmesteter, it was unheeded, for we find ourselves driven from one to the other horn of his pitiless dilemma: tradition or the Vedas. This intrusion of Vedism does not seem at first to harmonize with the claims of the partisans of tradition that Zend studies are to keep aloof from outside influences and form a self-supporting branch of oriental learning. The fact that both auxiliaries, though from opposite directions, favor the mythical import of Mazdeism may explain their momentary alliance, for it has become the characteristic purpose of M. Darmesteter's works to prove that the Iranians had a mythology but no religion. A few years ago he prepared the way for his version by a work on 'Ormazd and Ahriman,' which was meant to establish, in a most sweeping argument and with an interesting display of erudition, that the Mazdean gods, beliefs, nay Zoroaster himself, were nothing but parts of the Iranian version of the favorite myth of Vedism, the fire-myth. Some exceptions were taken to this view. It was claimed that Mazdeism was too massive, too eminently original, to be explained by anything but an *ex parte* development, and that the oldest parts of the Avesta pointed to a moment in the religion when a new spirit had made irruption and changed the course of Iranian thought. The only effect of these objections, which M. Darmesteter otherwise briefly acknowledges, is seen in the increased precision with which he reiterates his statements; for him 'the gods, the ideas, the worship of Mazdeism are shown to emanate directly from the old religion,' *i. e.*, the fire-myth (p. lxxix). Indeed, so absolute is his denegation of the spontaneity of Iranian beliefs, so great his care to stop all loopholes through which any characteristic thought might find access into Mazdeism as he views it, that we are startled when in one place we find him speaking of 'the moral and abstract spirit which pervades Mazdeism and is so different from the Vedic spirit,' and in another of 'the new spirit that

breathed in the religion.' Yet, surely, the spirit that breathes in the Avesta must once have been a new spirit. We need no other witness to that effect than the Vendidâd itself, in the very version we discuss. Its manly enforcement of probity and honest work, its copious rules of purification and atonement, all points to a current of thoughts better than naturalism: it is a system of morals, turned sere as all systems will when the spirit is at its ebb, but its nobleness stands out amid the puerile fancies of the age. Nor is this moral feature peculiar to our book. The teachings of generations had so impressed it on the vast nation of Mazdean believers as to make it the national stamp, to which the early Greek travellers uniformly bear witness. In truth, the moment Mazdeism emerges from obscurity the myths recede, theology is raised above the swarming confusion of naturalism, and moral ends take the place of grovelling superstition. Placed in their natural connection, the Vendidâd and the old hymns represent a fabric of spiritual doctrines so closely framed that the wearing influences of several ages and nations will be needed before naturalism breaks through it and mixes its flimsy threads with the decaying tissue. Unless the testimony of the older Avesta be proved unreliable, and unless it be shown that myths by sheer decrepitude turn to ethics, I shall keep to the belief that the morals of Mazdeism and its early theology were born together, spontaneously, and once 'turned the stream' of Iranian thoughts into a purer bed.

M. Darmesteter has taken pains, both in his Introduction and in his notes, to prick the long streak of fire which marks the evolutions of the storm-myth in the Avesta. His version does not seem at first to present the tinge which strongly colored surroundings might be supposed to give it, for, in reality, though the mythical element is by no means absent from the Vendidâd, it is evidently additional, accumulated in places, and might be struck out without altering the general impression produced by the book. On close examination, however, one sees that there is a mythical as well as a traditional bias. In the first Fargard which gives, as the tradition and most scholars believe, the sum of the geographical data of the Avesta, he sees under no less than three or four of the countries mentioned the mythical land on high where light gods wrestle with dark demons, an opinion which is sufficiently refuted, I think, by the fact that he grants to the twelve or thirteen others a geographical status; nor, when there is a doubt, are we kept long in suspense as to the ultimate determination of the sense. In F. V, 8, the

question, most interesting for the Mazdean believer in the purity of Ahura's creation, is raised by Zoroaster whether water kills. Our translator gives Ahura's answer as follows: 'Water kills no man; *astōvidhōtu* ties the noose around his neck, and thus tied, Vaya carries him off; then the flood takes him up, the flood takes him down, the flood throws him ashore; then birds feed upon him, and chance brings him here or brings him there.' This is a very smooth version, but let us examine. *Astōvidhōtu*, the bone-breaker, is an Avestic creation easily understood without the help of the Vedas; the sleight of hand through which the writer creates an analogy to Vedic Yama, the king of death, translating arbitrarily 'ties the noose around his neck' a verb that simply means 'ties,' was more than superfluous; yet he has done more, he has enriched the Iranian mythology with a new god, for, though there is a Vayu mentioned in divers places, there is no voucher for the Vaya of our passage. Here is, on the other side, Geldner's version: 'Water does not kill man, but the bone-breaker fetters him and the current (Vayas) carries him away bound; the water draws him upwards, then downwards, and throws him out; then the birds eat him up; his self lands beyond.'

The second Fargard contains the Vendidâd version of the legend of Yima (and, as many believe, of the deluge), an episode which suggests more problems than I have room even to mention. That it is an echo of an old Aryan myth is now a matter of common consent, nor is it lacking in the Iranian native note. It is furthermore possible that Semitic intercourse had its share in making up the tradition. To mark out the exact part those three possible factors have borne in the shaping of the legend is a most delicate task, and one which requires a mind free from any one-sided interest in the results; the first step, at any event, is to let the Avesta speak, without swaying it this or that way according as one is inclined. I will not, of course, magnify the gentle touch of M. Darmesteter's pen into a gross assault on the texts, yet even that touch, at a given moment, imprints on a passage the stamp needed to fix the sense. Thus, among others, the 10th verse is translated with more or less precision, thus: 'Then Yima stepped forward towards the light on the sun's noon-day path,' or, 'went forward in the light of day, at noon time, on the sun's path.' Whither he went, southwards or westwards, matters but little. M. Darmesteter renders: 'Then Yima stepped forward towards the luminous space, southwards to *meet* the sun,' a turn which certainly is not in strict accordance with

the text, and is obviously intended to fix more firmly on Yima's brow the bright diadem of a sun-god, if, at least, we understand the foot-note which ends with the words: 'In Mazdean mythology the sun is, as is well known, the symbol and source of royalty.'

With the preceding example my task is over; I have said enough to justify my conclusions. At the first glance, this work is a bright and spirited rendering of a book which was not held to be either, and bids fair to win for it and also for Iranian studies the attention of the reading public. If the chief aim of the translator was to bring out in the strongest light the best sense to be elicited from tradition he has been eminently successful; the outcome, however, seems to us an honor paid to the native commentators rather than the simple and direct interpretation of the Vendidâd, which we had a right to expect. As far as the sub-interpretation of the texts by the naturalistic myth is concerned, I cannot but acknowledge the frankness and skill with which the writer has avowed and championed his views. There is perhaps more truth in them than is apparent to me. Time will decide. To take them, however, out of the Introduction, and weave them through the rendering before they have risen from the hypothetical stage, seems to me an unwarranted way of gaining for them, under cover and at the expense of the Mazdean books, an adhesion and a tribute which otherwise had been denied.

JULES LUQUIENS.

III.—NOTES ON PLACIDUS.

P. 9, 9 (Deuerling). *Arceram* vehiculum in arcae modum *confixum*, *non utique plastrum*, *id est carrum*. Comparing Gellius 20, 1, 29 *arcera* autem vocabatur *plastrum* tectum undique et munitum, we may correct the text of Placidus thus: *arceram* vehiculum: in arcae modum *convexum munitumque plastrum*, *id est carrum*.

P. 11, 7. Deuerling reads *Aeruscans*, *aes minutum* [colligens.] *Accurate*† *construens*. *Colligens* is an addition of Müller's, which, although it helps out the first three words of the text, makes nonsense of the last two. The MSS. give *aeruscans* (or *aeruscus*), *aes minutum* *accurate construens* (or *colligens*). Comparing Paulus p. 24 *aeruscare*, *aera* undique, *id est pecunias*, *colligere*, it would seem natural to suppose that two glosses have, in the text of Placidus, been made out of one, which should run *Aeruscans*, *aes minutum accurate construens*.

P. 12, 16. s. v. *agoniae*. Hostiarum autem [immolatione] deos aequos fieri, *id est propitos*, *praeter antiquos agebant*. Perhaps *preces antiquae* significant.

P. 14, 1. *Bardum*, hebetem, stolidum, *brutum*. So Deuerling: but the MSS. give *stolidum bretendum*. The corrupt *bretendum* may stand for *Graece βραδόν*: Paulus p. 34 *bardus* . . . trahitur . . . a Graeco quod illi βραδός dicunt; comp. Nonius p. 10.

P. 22, 23. *Cis Rhenum*, *citra* (so rightly Deuerling for *intra*) *Rhenum*; *coniecturae factae*. Here two glosses have apparently been confused into one; the second should run *conjecturae, σφαγαί*. *Consector* (see the Dictt.) is used by Suetonius in the sense of a slaughterer, and *consectorarius* and *conjecturarius* are quoted from inscriptions.

P. 24, 5. *Coicere*, *conicere*, *coercere*. So Deuerling. The Corsianus alone has *coicere* at the beginning of the note, and for *conicere* it reads *coijcere*, while the Hamburg MS. has *coniescere*. From these indications I conjecture that the gloss should run thus: *coinquere, compescere, coercere*. Paulus p. 65 *coinquere, coercere*.

P. 25, 4. *Conlocare*, *deputare*. Surely *conlucare*. Paulus p. 37 *conlucare* dicebant cum profanae silvae rami deciderentur officientes lumini.

P. 25, 7. *Caesditum*, creditum. For *caesditum* Deuerling rightly prints *caesicium*: for *creditum* Christ writes *cretatum*: would not *candidum* be better? Nonius p. 539 *caesicium* *linteolum* dicitur *purum* et *candidum*.

P. 28, 2. *Conivolis*, crebro nutantibus. *Conivolis* was introduced, no doubt rightly, by Kettner, from Paulus p. 61, *conivoli oculi sunt in angustum coacti coniventibus palpebris*. The MSS. of Placidus give *conibus*. But for *crebro nutantibus*, which is the reading of the *liber glossarum*, the MSS. of Placidus have *crevronitatis*, which may stand for *crebro nictantibus*. See Löwe, *Prodromus Glossariorum* p. 15, where a gloss *conivolis* frequenter nutantibus is rightly corrected into *frequenter nictantibus*.

P. 28, 19. *Cassae aerumnae*. I conjecture *casses*, *araneae*. Servius on Aen. 11, 105 *vestimenta araneorum casses dicimus*. Schol. Bern. Georg. 4, 247 *notandum aranearum texta casses dicta*, cum *casses* proprie dicantur quidam sinus ex modico reti facti qui . . . feras decipiunt.

P. 30, 5. *Cattulum* cinguli genus, a coacto loro *caltulae*. So Deuerling, but the MSS. readings are as follows: *cattulum* a coacto lare (or *loro*) calte (or *calce*). Now it is true that Isidore 19, 33, 4 says *cattulum* a coacto loro dictum; but Nonius p. 548 has the words *cattulam* et *crocotulam* utrumque a generibus florum translatum *caltae* et *croci*. It is therefore not improbable, considering that the manuscripts of Placidus have *calte*, not *cattulae*, that the gloss both in Placidus and Isidore should run *cattulum vocatum a colore caltae*; the words *a coacto loro* or *lare* standing for *vocatum a colore*.

P. 38, 20. *Echo* Graecum nomen est. Est autem imago vocis quae in concavis locis resultat offensa ac resonat . . . *Appellatus est autem ut Herculem, Liberum patrem, Castorem et Pollucem pagani dicunt*. The last part of this gloss has evidently nothing to do with Echo; some god or hero in the masculine gender is required, who may be placed in the same category with Hercules, Liber, Castor and Pollux. The hero is probably Aeneas, spelt *Eneas*: Servius Aen. 6, 134, *bis Stygios innare lacus*, modo et post mortem; quod autem dicit Ovidius Aeneam inter deos relatum, non mirum est. Nam, ut supra diximus, necesse est etiam relatorum inter deos apud inferos esse simulacra, ut *Herculis, Liberi patris, Castoris et Pollucis*. Horace Epist. 2, 1, 5, mentions *Romulus et Liber pater et cum Castore Pollux*, and soon after Hercules, in the same connection.

P. 50, 1. *Gnarificationum* sermonum. So Deuerling from the *liber glossarum*: but the manuscripts of Placidus give *gnari cantionum*, for which we should perhaps read *gnarigationum*. Paulus p. 95 *gnarigavit* significat apud Livium *narravit*.

P. 58, 16. *In mundo*, in expedito vel ad manum, in procinctu. Here two glosses are probably confused, the second of which began with *in procinctu*. For *in mundo* is by no means synonymous with *in procinctu*, and Paulus p. 109 has separate notes on the two phrases.

P. 59, 9. *Iurgio*, incursione. Surely *iurgio*, *iuris actione*. Paulus p. 103 *iurgatio*, *iuris actio*.

P. 59, 11. *In burim*, in curvationem. Deuerling suggests that *in burim* should be corrected into *imburvum*; there is however no need for this; see Servius and Philargyrius on Georg. 1, 170 domatur in burim.

P. 59, 22. *Iactatus*, inductus, captus. *Lactatus*: Paulus p. 117 *lacit*, unde *lactat*. Nonius p. 16 *lactare* est inducere vel mulcere, velle decipere.

P. 66, 24. *Magmentum* . . . Cornutus, quicquid *mactatur*, id est quicquid distrahitur. For *mactatur* the MSS. of Placidus give *mactus*, whence it is possible that the true reading is *quicquid macitur*, id est quicquid distrahitur.

P. 67, 7. *Manas*, malas, maxillas. Probably a confusion of two glosses, the first of which began *manas* or *manias* (comp. Festus p. 128 s. v. *manias*) and the second *malas*, maxillas.

P. 79, 23. *Sublevit*, subiunxit, a liniendo. *Subunxit*, a linendo? *Subunctio* is quoted in the lexicons from Caelius Aurelianus.

P. 84, 4. *Tabes*, cruor, sanguis. This gloss seems to be a corrupted abbreviation of a note in which *tabus*, *cruor*, and *sanguis* were distinguished: Schol. Veron. Aen. 8, 106 Asper: *cruor* proprie dicitur, nam quamdiu in corpore est, *sanguis* est, cum fluit *cruor*, cum exiit *tabus* est.

HENRY NETTLESHIP.

IV.—WHAT IS ARTICULATION?

The terms *articulate*, *articulation*, *inarticulate*, and their relatives, are in common use as applied to human speech. But, as in many other like cases, we perhaps employ them for the most part without proper comprehension, or even with a false apprehension, of what they really mean. The matter is one which is worth a little careful examination.

In a general way, articulation is held to be a distinctive character of our spoken speech, as contrasted both with our own inarticulate utterances, such as laughing, crying, groaning, yelling, and with the more or less analogous utterances of the lower animals. If this popular view is a true one, there ought to be no insuperable difficulty in the way of giving a scientific definition of the character, now that the processes of utterance are so well understood. Authorities, however, are by no means agreed with regard to the point. Professor Heyse of Berlin, for example, when I heard his general course on language in 1850, after giving notice at a certain point that in his next lecture he should define articulate and inarticulate utterance, laid down their difference as follows: "Articulate utterance is such as is naturally produced by human organs; inarticulate, such as is naturally produced by other than human organs." Since, now, we are able to reproduce with our organs many of the sounds of the lower animals, there was evidently no great satisfaction in this. Even so much as this, however, seems to have disappeared from the modern German use of the word. Thus, in Heyse's own *System der Sprachwissenschaft*, as edited after his death by Steinkhal, no such definition as the one given above is to be found; but he says (p. 75) of the tone of voice, as produced by the vibration of the vocal chords, that it "is articulated only by the various shaping of the mouth-canal and the coöperation of the oral organs of speech, and so becomes a 'vowel'; and he again (p. 120) defines consonantal articulation as "the pressure or interference (*Stemmung*) of the organs of speech." This has the aspect of being developed from the other view in some such way as the following: "human speech is articulate, or 'articulated'; to articulate, therefore, is to utter with human organs; hence, every

act by which a human utterance is produced is an articulating act, or an articulation." The difficulty here evidently is, that all distinctive meaning is taken out of *articulation*, which becomes merely a synonym for 'human utterance.' It implies the confession: "speech is articulate; but what makes it so it is impossible to tell; articulation is simply speaking, and that is the end of the matter."

But there is still one more downward step possible in the application of the term, and that step has been taken in recent scientific usage. By Heyse, it is limited to the action of the organs above the larynx, and at least impliedly to that of human organs: in certain later treatises of phonetics, both these limitations are abandoned. To take as an example the latest (and, for the student of language, in many respects the best) of them—Sievers, in his *Lautphysiologie*, when treating of the subject, first describes or defines the condition of the organs in breathing, their "position of rest or indifference," and goes on: "So long as the organs of speech continue in such position the production of a speech-sound is impossible; in order to this, at least a part of them must be moved out of that position, and put as hindrance in the way of the current of breath: in other words, an *articulation* must take place" (p. 15; 2d edition, p. 17). Once more, in Techmer (*Vergleichende Physiologie der Stimme und Sprache*, Leipzig, 1880) we find: "We further call *articulation* every sound-forming or sound-modifying departure from the position of indifference on the part of the organs that border the current of breath" (p. 19). Both these authorities, accordingly, with due consistency, describe the vocal chords themselves as the first articulating organ, and speak of their various articulating positions.¹ To put any organ, or complex of organs, then, in position for producing a sound, is to articulate; and, as no sound can ever be produced without such putting in position, every sound made by organs of utterance is an articulate sound. Hence, to speak of an articulate utterance is tautology; inarticulate utterance is a *contradictio in adjecto*; an articulate sound is an uttered sound; to articulate is to utter. And not to utter as language only. Professor Sievers does, indeed, in his definition above quoted, specify a "speech-sound" (*Sprach-*

¹ And Sievers states that Techmer argues (probably in his *Anmerkungen*, which are not in my hands) in favor of extending the idea of articulation to the process of breathing also. Further than this, surely, no one could go. All animals with lungs, then, would be always articulating, willy-nilly, awake or asleep, till their last breath.

laut), but evidently without any justification; for precisely the same "articulating" action is necessary in order to make with the organs of utterance any audible sound whatever, as a groan, a giggle, a grunt, a sneeze. And, not less evidently, the utterances of beasts involve the same "articulation." Their organs also have a "position of rest," which must be deviated from if anything is to be heard, and which they in fact do deviate from, by action more or less voluntary, just as our organs do. All utterance, of whatever kind, by animate beings, is articulation; inarticulate are only such noises as the clapping of the hands, the snapping of the fingers, the drumming of partridges, the wing-scrapings of chafers, and the like.

All this, it seems to me, is a misuse of a term having a real and valuable significance of its own.

The word, namely, goes back to Greek *ἐναρθρός*, which means simply 'jointed,' and is, of course, used primarily in a physical sense, of a limb, a stalk of grass or of reed, and so on. The verb *ἐναρθρώω* does not appear to occur, though implied in its derivative *ἐνάρθρωσις*, beside which is found *διάρθρωσις*, and its verb *διαρθρώω*; the simple *ἀρθρώω* is also used. These, then, are rendered into Latin by the verb *articulo*, denominative of *articulus*, 'joint,' with its various derivatives; and *articulatus* means 'jointed,' physically and figuratively.

Now the term "jointed" is precisely, and in the highest sense, descriptive of human speech-utterance, as distinguished from our other utterances, and from the sounds produced by the organs of the lower animals. Language moves on by a succession of parts similar and yet distinct, closely united and yet separate from one another, movable as it were upon one another's extremities, like the divisions of a limb, or the links of a jointed chain—*catenated* would have been a nearly equivalent and only less happy name for the same thing. These joints are the syllables: articulate virtually equals syllabic. And the syllabic effect, as I have shown,¹ is given by the alternation of closer or consonantal with opener or vowel elements, the interposition of the former between the latter; the continuous current of uttered tone is broken into joints to the ear just as a uniform flexible tube would be to the eye by tying threads more or less closely about it from point to point. Thus,

¹ See Oriental and Linguistic Studies, ii. 294, and Journal Am. Or. Soc., viii. 360; where, so far as I know, the point is for the first time clearly stated and illustrated.

whereas inarticulate utterance is holophrastic or not separately significant in its parts, and limited in duration, because nothing is gained by its protraction, articulate utterance is indefinitely continuable, because each joint in the series has its own character and value, and their multiplication is the multiplication of meaning.

This understanding of *articulate* not only is deducible with confidence from the etymological sense of the term itself, as taken in connection with the essential character of speech-utterance which it successfully describes, but it is, in my view, clearly suggested by the often-quoted passage (*Hist. anim.* iv. 9) in which Aristotle lays down his view of the fundamental laws of utterance. After stating that tone ($\varphiωνή$) is produced by the throat solely and alone, and that hence creatures without lungs make no sound, he goes on: "Speech is the articulation ($\deltaιάρθρωσις$, 'separation into joints') of tone by the tongue. So then, the tone and the larynx emit the vowels ($\varphiωνήεντα$, 'tone-sounds'), but the tongue and the lips the consonants ($\ddot{\alpha}\varphiωνα$, literally 'toneless sounds')—of which speech consists." The sense seems clear enough: vowels are pure tone, made by the throat without help of the other parts ($οὐδέντι τῶν ἀλλων μορίων$); the tongue—or, more fully, the tongue and the lips—produces the consonants: and the consonant-making action of the tongue causes that articulation or jointing of the tone which constitutes speech.

Articulation, then, consists not in the mode of production of individual sounds, but in the mode of their combination for the purposes of speech. Hence—and this is a most important part of the significance of the term—it does not depend on any peculiarity of structure in the human organs of speech, but on the manner of their use, as developed by education and practice: it is not physical, but historical. We have every reason to believe that language began with monosyllabic utterances: perhaps first pure vowels, then open syllables, then (more questionably) close syllables: one such utterance was the equivalent in meaning of a whole modern sentence; a simple voice-gesture, as it were, directly intelligible under the circumstances of its production. Then, in the growth of speech, these utterances were made complex, partly

¹ Aristotle does not make the distinction of sonant and surd sounds. To him, the $\varphiωνήεντα$ are those sounds in which the element of tone predominates; $\ddot{\alpha}\varphiωνα$, those lacking clear tone—including, for instance, both β and π . The intermediate class of $\eta\muί\varphiωνα$, continuable consonants, elsewhere recognized by him, he here for simplicity's sake ignores.

by repetition, passing over into reduplication, and partly by association with other like utterances. The association was doubtless at the outset, phonetically as in meaning, a rude and loose one: the speaker made one utterance, and then began again and made another; but it grew closer, in both respects, by practice; and when speech became continuous, an unbroken succession of alternating consonantal and vowel products, then it for the first time gained a fully articulated character.¹ The articulation was in part syntactical only, syllable and word falling together as one, as even down to the present time in Chinese; in part there arose an agglomeration, in tongues of more developed structure, of the syllabic elements into polysyllabic words; and words as well as sentences became articulated, each member of both having its own part to play in the conveyance of intended meaning. We may see the whole process of development repeated in miniature in the acquisition of language by each new speaker: the at first isolated utterances, and the gradually increased facility of combination, until at last the art of continuous and rapid articulation is won. I see no reason to believe that the lower animals, so far as their organs are concerned, would not be capable of the same mode of utterance, provided they had the intellectual capacity to form and transmit, and develop in the transmission, a traditional body of expression. In fact, some animals are trained to imitate with entire intelligibility our articulated words and phrases.

It appears to me, therefore, that the term *articulate* is one of the happiest hits ever made in the way of nomenclature by the ancient founders of our civilization and science; it designates better than any other word the phonetic character of human speech, as determined by the education and development of human intelligence. We ought, it should seem, at least to be able to understand and apply it properly. If the popular apprehension of its meaning is

¹ It is by inattention to this that Sievers is misled into repeating (2d ed., p. 156), in his definition of the syllable, the old blunder that it is what "is produced by an independent, continuous effort of expiration (*Expirationshub*)."
This is true only of the ante-articulated stage of speech. As we now utter *ala*, for example, the effort is in a certain sense a single one, and in a certain sense threefold; but there is no proper sense whatever in which it is double. The *a*-tone is broken into two parts (joints) which are completely joined together by the intervening *l*-sound that makes them two; there is no stopping and beginning again; the whole is continuous; the *l* is as fully united by a slide or movement of transition to the preceding *a* as to the following one.

indistinct or incorrect, phonetic science should set the matter right, not make it worse. It is doubtless true that the exigencies of practical use are paramount, and that, if a language has no available expression for 'utter,' it is justified in impressing for that service even such a word as *articulate*; but this should at any rate be done under the excuse and with the confession of poverty, and not as if a mere thing of course, involving no regrettable degradation of a term once pregnant with valuable meaning.

W. D. WHITNEY.

NOTES.

VARIA.

I.—*Sophocles*, Oed. Tyr., vs. 328-9 in most editions read:

πάντες γὰρ οὐ φρονεῖτ^ρ. ἐγὼ δού μήποτε
τἄμ' ὡς ἀν εἰπω μὴ τὰ σ' ἔκφήνω κακά.

The words *τἄμ'* *ώς* *ἄν* are plain nonsense. Dindorf says they are interpolated, but does not suggest a substitute for them. A recent critic in the *'Αθήνας* proposes to read *ἰταμῶς τάδ' εἰπω*, which gives good sense, but involves an unnecessarily violent change. Much preferable would be *ἰταμῶς ἀνείπω*; but the adverb *ἰταμῶς* seems to be late Greek, and *ἀνείπον* without an object would be somewhat difficult to render. The true reading appears to be *τάδ' ὡς ἀνείπω*, which involves the change of only one letter and gives exactly the sense required. "For ye are all in ignorance; but even so (*ώς*) I will never publish these things lest I bring to light your woes." *'Ανείπον* and *ἔκφαίνω* occur in the same sentence in Xenoph. Kyr. IV, 5, 56.

In the same play v. 37, instead of *καὶ ταῦθ' ὅφ' ἡμῶν οὐδὲν ἐξειδὼς πλέον*, which in the circumstances would be meaningless, I would read *καὶ ταῦτα φημῶν κ.τ.λ.*, which expresses exactly what Oedipus no doubt wished to be believed. *Φήμη* is frequently used, even in this play, in the sense of *χρησμός*.

v. 227, *καὶ μὲν φοβεῖται, τούπτικλημ' ὑπεξελῶν*, which seems to have caused so much trouble to editors, may be corrected with ease and almost perfect certainty by reading *καὶ μὴ φοβεῖσθαι*, which makes the whole passage simple and logical. The only objection to this emendation is that *ὑπεξελῶν* is in the nominative case, whereas we should expect *ὑπεξελόντα*; but such anacoloutha in the case of participles are by no means uncommon. See the examples cited by Kühner, Gr. Gr. § 493.

In the difficult lines, 478-9,

πετραιὸς δ' ταῦρος
μέλεος μελέψ ποδὶ χηρεύων

or as some read,

πέτρας, ὡς ταῦρος κ.τ.λ.

I believe we ought to read

$\pi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\alpha\varsigma$ $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma$ $\tau\alpha\bar{\nu}\rho\varsigma$

and correct the corresponding line in the strophe by adding a ς to $\pi\bar{\nu}\delta\alpha$, so as to read

$\varphi\psi\gamma\bar{\varsigma}$ $\pi\bar{\nu}\delta\alpha\varsigma$ $\nu\omega\mu\bar{\nu}\varsigma$.

$\Sigma\theta\epsilon\nu\alpha\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\epsilon\rho\varsigma$ in the line above may, of course, be an adverb. This makes sense and metre both perfect.

II.—One of the most curious examples of that tendency, so common among German critics, to alter the text of an author in favor of a preconceived and false theory, occurs in Pausanias V 11, 8, where the author is describing the base of the throne of the Olympian Zeus. In the ordinary editions the passage reads thus: 'Ἐπὶ τούτου τοῦ βάθρου χρυσᾶ ποιήματα, ἀναβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ἄρμα Ἡλίος, καὶ Ζεύς τέ ἐστι καὶ Ἡρα, παρὰ δὲ αὐτὸν Χάρις· ταύτης δὲ Ἐρυῆς ἔχεται, τοῦ δὲ Ἐρμοῦ Ἔστία· μετὰ δὲ τὴν Ἔστίαν Ἐρωτίς, ἐστὶν ἐκ θαλάσσης Ἀφροδίτην ἀνισθαν ὑπόδεχόμενος· τὴν δὲ Ἀφροδίτην στεφανοῖ Πειθώ. ἐπείργασται δὲ καὶ Ἀπόλλων σὸν Ἀρτέμιδη, Ἀθηνᾶ τε καὶ Ἡραχλῆς, καὶ ἡδη τοῦ βάθρου πρὸς τῷ πέρατι Ἀμφιτρίτη καὶ Ποσειδῶν, Σελήνη τε ἵππον ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν ἐλαύνοντα. Now, for some inconceivable reason or another, all German archaeologists, *e. g.* Overbeck, Brunn, Petersen, have assumed that the subject of the work here described was the birth of Aphrodite, and that the figures were arranged in this order, beginning at the left: Helios, Zeus, Hera, Charis, [Hephaistos], Hermes, Hestia—Eros, Aphrodite, Peitho—Apollo, Artemis, Athena, Herakles, Amphitrite, Poseidon, Selene. This makes Aphrodite the central figure; but in order to have the same number of personages on each side of her, the name of Hephaistos has to be violently inserted. This the upholders of the theory justify on the ground that $\alpha\bar{\nu}\tau\bar{\nu}$ in the phrase $\pi\bar{\nu}\rho\bar{\alpha}\delta\bar{\epsilon}$ $\alpha\bar{\nu}\tau\bar{\nu}$ $\chi\bar{\alpha}\rho\bar{\iota}\varsigma$, implies that the name of some male divinity has been left out. But it is perfectly plain, for a dozen reasons, that the subject of the work was not the birth of Aphrodite at all,—indeed, with what propriety could the birth of Aphrodite from the sea have been made the subject of the only decoration of the base of the statue of Zeus?—but the marriage of Zeus and Hera, a most appropriate subject for the position. I have demonstrated this at length in an article in the *American Art Review*. Pausanias, after speaking of the sun,

already risen above the level of the group of gods, begins his description of that group in his usual, and indeed in the only natural way, with the middle figures. The group then arranges itself in the most natural way thus: Helios (above the group), Peitho, Aphrodite, Eros, Hestia, Hermes, Charis—Hera, Zeus—Apollo, Artemis, Athena, Herakles, Poseidon, Amphitrite, Selene (above the group). The sun and moon are in the sky, the two end groups in the sea, the rest upon Olympus. On each side of the bridal pair are six figures. All that is necessary in order to make the passage in Pausanias correct, is to change one letter, and read *αὐτὴν* for *αὐτόν*—*παρὰ δὲ αὐτὴν Χάρις*.

III.—*Herodotos* VIII, 64. It is curious what mistakes a mere etymological and grammatical interpretation of Greek will sometimes lead people into. Herodotos, describing the preparations for the battle of Salamis, says: "Ἐδοξε δέ σφι (τοῖς στρατηγοῖς) εὖξασθαι τοῖς θεοῖσι καὶ ἐπικαλέσασθαι τοὺς Αἰακίδας συμμάχους . . . εὐξάμενοι γάρ πᾶσι τοῖς θεοῖσι αὐτόθεν μὲν ἐκ Σαλαμῖνος Αἴαντά τε καὶ Τελαμῶνα ἐπεκαλέοντο, ἐπὶ δὲ Αἰακὸν καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους Αἰακίδας νέα ἀπέστελλον ἐς Αἴγιναν. Rawlinson gives the following translation of these words: "Whereupon the Greeks resolved to *approach the gods with prayer*, and likewise to *send and invite* the Aeacids to their aid. . . . *Prayers were offered* to all the gods; and Telamon and Ajax *were invoked at once* from Salamis, while a ship was sent to Aegina to fetch Aeacus himself, and the other Aeacids." Now, in one instance *ἐπικαλέομαι* is translated *to send and invite*, in another *to invoke*. In the present connection neither rendering is correct. The meaning in both cases is "to send and bring." *Αὐτόθεν*, moreover, does not mean "at once," but "from where they were"—*αὐτόθεν ἐκ Σαλαμῖνος*, from Salamis where they were. This is plain from the fact that a ship was sent to Aegina to fetch the statues of the Aeacidae there worshipped. Had there been a mere question of inviting or invoking, the ship would have been entirely unnecessary.

Again, *εὖξασθαι* is translated, in one instance, *to approach* (the gods) *with prayer*, in another, *to offer prayers*. Again the translation is wrong in both cases. The true rendering is "to make vows." This is plainly shown by a passage in Plutarch's *Life of Perikles* (cap. xvii), where we are told that the great Athenian statesman sent to all the states of Greece asking them *πέμπειν Αθήνας τοὺς βουλευσομένους περὶ . . . τῶν θυσιῶν, ἀς διφείλουσιν*

ὑπὲρ τῆς Ἑλλάδος εὖ μενοι τοῖς θεοῖς (as having *vowed* them to the gods) *ὅτε πρὸς τὸν βαρβάρους ἐμάχοντο.* We are too apt to forget that praying among the Greeks and Romans, at least on all great occasions, involved voweding, and that the voweding, indeed, was the object of the praying. I have no doubt that the Homeric phrases *πολλὰ εὐζησθαι* and *μεγάλα εὐζησθαι* should in every case be rendered, respectively, "to vow many offerings," and "to vow large offerings." One might indeed pray much (*πολλά*); but it is hard to see how one could pray large or big (*μεγάλα*). What is true of *εὐζημαί* is true of *ἀρᾶσθαι*: See Iliad I, 35 and 43, where the two words are used of the same act. In line 35, the words *πολλὰ ἡρᾶτο* can hardly mean "he prayed much"; for the prayer is given, and occupies only six lines. It must mean he "vowed much," and indeed a very large offering is *implied* in the prayer. No doubt there is plenty of examples of the use of *εὐζημαί* in which the element of voweding is not at all prominent.

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

BEOWULF. An Old English Poem, translated into modern rhymes, by Lieutenant Colonel H. W. LUMSDEN, late Royal Artillery. London, 1881.

The interest in "Beowulf" is unflagging. Some of the zeal which the Germans for many years have devoted to its elucidation seems to have been carried across the Channel, and besides the edition of Arnold published a few years ago (1876), which seems to have given the stimulus to this work, we now have another verse translation of the poem.

Conybeare in 1826 first gave us copious extracts translated into blank verse, and of genuine poetic merit; but Wackerbarth in 1849 first published a complete poetic version of the poem, which he began twelve years before, soon after the publication of Kemble's text. We have had to wait twenty-two years for a second poetic translation, although the texts of Thorpe and Arnold, as well as that of Kemble, are accompanied by a prose translation. Meantime, in addition to the translation of Ettmüller (1840), we have had German poetical versions from Grein (1857), Simrock (1859), Heyne (1863), and von Wolzogen (1873); the Danes have supplied two translations, Grundtvig's (1820) and Schaldemose's (1847), and the French have at last begun to study the poem, Botkine having published a prose translation (1877). These versions, with the prose translation of extracts given by Sharon Turner (1805), and the Latin translation of Thorkelin attached to his edition (1815), the first ever published—for which, with all its defects, he will be ever remembered—show that "Beowulf" is a much-translated poem, even if we have few English translations.

Col. Lumsden has done well to present the poem again in an English dress, for, as he well says: "Its real value—considered as an historical authority merely—lies in the vivid picture it gives us of the life, the manners, and the habits of thought and speech of our forefathers in that 'dark backward and abysm of time,'" and doubtless few will seek this information in the original. It is evident that Col. Lumsden has regarded the poem from a literary and not a critical point of view. He has "used Grein's text," and relied much upon Arnold; but he used the text of Grein as given in the *Bibliothek der A. S. Poesie* (1857), the same which Arnold used,¹ and not Grein's later and revised text of the separate edition (1867), nor does he seem to have made any reference to Heyne's text. Here again we have a lover of "Beowulf" neglecting the two best German editions of the text. One passage which shows this is line 20, where Grein read "gleaw guma" in '57, and so given by Arnold, but "geong guma" in '67, which Lumsden translates "wise man." Also in line 15 Col. Lumsden translates *aldorleise* for Grein's ('67) *aldorceare*. Some other lines in which the texts vary are translated too freely to show the difference of reading,

¹ I have already (Am. Jour. Phil. I, 2, 90) expressed my conviction that Arnold's text is printed from Thorpe's with some changes to correspond to Grein's text in the *Bibliothek*.

and one crucial passage, lines 83-86, is omitted altogether with the remark, "the meaning is exceedingly obscure." There are several such omissions, *e.g.*, lines 767-770, 1724-1758, where Col. Lumsden thinks "Old Hrothgar displays a 'forty-person power' of dullness," which, however true, is not the question when we come to translate a poem, even though the passage may be an interpolation; 1931-1963, 2061-2, "the sense of which is very obscure"; 2214-2231, text corrupt; 2475, where Kemble and Thorpe think some lines may have dropped out and Arnold re-arranges the text, but Grein and Heyne make no change; 2930-32, which Thorpe calls corrupt, Arnold says "make no sense in their present context," and puts after 2478 and line 2475 immediately after them, but Grein and Heyne follow the MS.; 3150-3156, text very corrupt. There is difficulty in referring to Col. Lumsden's translation because he has neglected to number the lines or give the corresponding lines of the original, and has numbered his sections differently from the usual text.

Another passage which shows conclusively that Col. Lumsden has used Grein's text of 1857 only is line 2076, the much discussed *Hondscio*, where he says, "a difficult passage which I can only paraphrase, taking Grein's explanation of *hondscio, impetus manibus factus*," but Grein, '67, reads this as a proper name, in this agreeing with Grundtvig, Rieger, Bugge, Heyne, and Ettmüller (1875).

In the noted passage relating to Healfdene's children, line 62, Col. Lumsden seems to have misapprehended Grein, and so translated wrongly his text, for he says (p. 101): "Mr. Arnold thinks that Ela was the name of a fourth son of Healfdene, but Grein's explanation of the defective line, making Ela the son-in-law of Healfdene, seems simpler and better." But Grein reads: *hjrde ic paet Elan cwén [Ongenþeowes waes], Heðoscsylfingas, heals-gebedda*, evidently making Elan a daughter, as Arnold rightly states. If, however, the lists are open, and we must resort to conjecture to fill the missing half-line, why may we not read *æreste* or *ððere waes*, Elan being the first wife, and the Geatish maiden, mentioned line 2932, the mother of Onela and Ohthere, being the second wife of Ongentheow, or *vice versa*?

Col. Lumsden does not trouble himself about the origin of the poem, and the *Müllenhoff* or *Ettmüller* theory; but as he refers, in his Introduction, to the date and scene of the poem, it might have been as well to state that there is a "Homeric question" connected with "Beowulf."

I cannot think the vehicle used by Col. Lumsden the most suitable one for a poetic translation of "Beowulf." He must have written without the fear of Mr. Matthew Arnold before his eyes, who, in his lectures "On Translating Homer," has shown the unsuitability of the fourteen-syllable ballad measure for a translation of Homer; and "Beowulf" is our Anglo-Saxon Homer, but with a difference, which makes all the more against this measure. While Homer is "rapid in movement," to use Mr. Arnold's expression, "Beowulf" is not rapid in movement, and *a fortiori* the ballad measure is unsuitable for it. But "Beowulf" is grand, "Beowulf" is noble, in this coinciding with Homer, and, to take Mr. Arnold's testimony, "the ballad manner and movement are often either jaunty and smart, so not noble; or jog-trot and humdrum, so not powerful." There is another objection, which may apply to all rime-measures: there is a tendency to eke out the line with a word for the sake of the rime,

and this destroys the effect. The most suitable measure for a poet to use in translating "Beowulf" is the Miltonic blank verse, for the very objection to it made by Mr. Arnold in the case of Homer, its lack of rapidity, makes it all the more suitable for "Beowulf." When a knowledge of Anglo-Saxon poetry becomes a more common possession, that poet will arise, and we shall have a translation of "Beowulf" which will give the general public an idea of its manner as well as of its matter.

But Col. Lumsden has made good use of his measure, and some passages are of real poetic worth, though he is not always at his best; and sometimes we have to scan the line, which should scan itself. The following passage (569-574) may serve to illustrate the best use:

Leóht eástan com
beorht beácen godes: brimu swaðredon,
þaet ic sênaessas geseón mihte,
windige weallas. Wyrd oft nereð
unfaegne eorl, þonne his ellen deáh !

This is a simple passage, and Col. Lumsden renders it well, except in the last line, where he fails altogether to give the force of *unfaegne*:

"Dawned in the east God's beacon bright,—the waves were lulled to sleep,
And I beheld the windy walls—the headlands of the sea.
For weird oft helps the fearless earl who battles manfully."

As, however, the translator, according to Wackerbarth (Preface, ad init.; I recommend the whole passage, too long for quotation), has a thankless task, for "he is called to account not only for his own faults, but likewise for the ignorance of many of his readers," I must do Col. Lumsden the justice to give the first canto, to which I add Wackerbarth's translation for comparison, as it is not readily accessible, and another made a few years ago, not by a poet, which still remains in MS., and whose only claim to consideration is its literalness, being line for line, with some attempt to imitate the rhythm of the original, and permitting alliteration where it comes of itself, but not seeking it by compulsion. I am aware that Mr. Matthew Arnold says: "The peculiar effect of a poet resides in his manner and movement, not in his words taken separately," and that he insists much upon "nobleness" in the translator; but as he gives us no rules for attaining this very desirable quality, if nature has not endowed us with it, we can only lament the fact, and do the best we can without it; perhaps he would say "*ne sutor*," but then if we never attempt, how can we ever succeed?

Col. Lumsden renders the opening canto as follows:

"Lo! we have heard of glory won by Gar-Dane Kings of old,
And mighty deeds these princes wrought. Oft with his warriors bold
Since first an outcast he was found, did Scyld the Scæfing hurl
From their mead-benches many a folk, and frightened many an earl.
Therein he took his pleasure, and waxed great beneath the sky,
And threw in worship, till to him all folk that dwelt hard by,
And o'er the whale-path, tribute paid, and did his word obey.
Good king was he !

To him was born an heir in after day,
 A child in hall ; the gift of God to glad the people sent ;
 For he had seen the long sore straits they, lordless, underwent.
 And therefore did the Prince of life, the Lord of glory, shower
 All worldly praise on him, the famed Beowulf;¹ and the power
 Of Scyld's great heir spread far and wide through all the Danish land.
 So must the wise man gift and fee deal forth with open hand
 Within his father's hall ; thereby, in age and time of fight,
 That comrades true may stand by him and help the folk aright.
 In every people men shall thrive by worthy deeds alone !
 Then to God's hands went mighty Scyld, his fated hour made known,
 And to the shore his comrades dear him carried as he bade
 While yet as Scylding's chief beloved he long the people swayed.
 Ready at hithe the ringed-stem lay,—meet for a prince's bier—
 Shining like ice—and to her lap they bore their chieftain dear ;
 Hard by the mast they laid him down, their glorious lord of rings.
 Well laden was the bark with wealth and far-brought precious things :
 In comelier wise no keel I trow before did ever sail,
 With weapons decked, and battle-weed, and bills, and coats of mail.
 Much treasure lay upon his breast, with him afar to go
 Into the might of waves. No lesser gifts did they bestow—
 A people's gifts—than they who sent him forth in days of old
 O'er seas, a little child, alone. And now a crest of gold
 High o'er his head they raised aloft ; and gave him to the flood
 To bear away to open sea, with grief and mourning mood.
 But not the wisest man in hall, nor bravest under heaven
 Can ever tell for sooth to whom that lordly freight was driven."

Wackerbarth uses a very different measure and varies it at pleasure :

" Lo ! We have learned in lofty Lays
 The Gár-Danes' Deeds in antient Days
 And Ages past away,
 The Glories of the Theod-Kings
 And how the valiant Aethelings
 Bare them in Battle's Day.
 Oft Scyld, the son of Scéf, from Bands
 Of foemen, drawn from numerous Lands,
 The Mead-thrones tare away :
 For Dread he cast on all around
 Sith he was first an Out-cast found.
 Thus he abode in easy State,
 And 'neath the Welkin waxéd great,
 And in his Glories thrave,
 Till circling Nations far and wide
 Over the Path the Whale doth ride
 Obeyed and Tribute gave.

¹ The reader must not confound this "Beowulf" with the hero of the poem, who is introduced later.

This was a Monarch good : and he
Was after bless'd with Progeny,
Young in his Palaces, by Heaven
A Comfort to the People given ;
He knew the Ill they had sustain'd
While chieftainless they long remain'd.
Therefore to him the Lord, whose Sway
Life and Death themselves obey,
Who Glory gives and takes away,
 Vouchsafed a high Command :
Illustrious was Beowulf's Name,
And widely spread the Scylding's Fame
 Through all the scatter'd Land.
Thus should a Warriour Chieftain bold
Enhance by prudent Gifts of Gold
 His Father's Dignity,
That when age-stricken is his Hand,
And War shall come upon his Land,
A voluntary warriour Band
 May round him marshall'd be.
He whom his People will sustain,
In every Land shall Honour gain,
 By Deeds of Chivalry.
But Scyld, at fated Time, departs
 Ripe, to the Lord's eternal Rest.
His Comrades dear with aching Hearts—
 According to his last Behest
While yet he own'd the Power of Speech,—
Bare forth his Corpse upon the Beach.
A ring-prow'd Ship there ready stood
Prepared to tempt the foaming Flood,
The Car the noble love to ride
It shone like Ice upon the Tide.
Within the goodly Vessel's Hold
 Their Monarch dear they cast.
Distributer of Rings of Gold,
 The mighty by the Mast.
And there were Gems and Treasure fair
From distant Climes collected there.
And never did I hear Man say
 Of comelier Ship, bedight
With Weeds of War for Battle's Fray,
With deadly Bills and Byrnies grey,
 And Weapons of the Fight.
Rich treasure in abundant Heap
 Upon his Bosom lay,
Into Possession of the Deep
 With him to pass away.

They would not send their Chief away
 With less Magnificence than they
 Who sent him forth of yore,
 To wander o'er the Ocean wild
 A lonely and deserted Child.
 They high above his Head unroll'd
 A fluttering Banner's Wings of Gold,
 And bear him let the Waters cold,
 To Ocean gave him o'er.
 His gallant Band of cheer were low,
 And sore dispirited,
 For, sooth to say, no Mortal, though
 He wise may be, can ever know,
 Nor answer how or whereunto
 The pretious Cargo sped."

The periphrasis in the last four lines is bad, and foreign to the simple directness of "Beowulf," but is evidently caused by the exigencies of the measure.

The third translator does not compete with the poets, but sticks to his text (Grein, '67):

"Lo ! we, of the Spear-Danes, in days of yore,
 The warrior-kings' glory have heard,
 How the princes heroic deeds wrought.
 Oft Scyld, son of Scef, from hosts of foes,
 5 From many tribes, their mead-seats took ;
 The earl caused terror since first he was
 Found thus forlorn ; gained he comfort for that,
 Grew under the clouds, in honors throne,
 Until each one of those dwelling around
 10 Over the whale-road him should obey,
 Should tribute pay : that was a good king !
 To him was a son afterwards born,
 Young in his palace, one whom God sent
 To the people for comfort : their distress he perceived,
 15 That they ere suffered life-eating care
 So long a while. Them therefor life's Lord,
 King of glory, world-honor gave :
 Beowulf was noted (wide spread his fame)
 The son of Scyld in Scedelands.
 20 So shall a young man with presents cause,
 With rich money-gifts in his father's house,
 That him in old age may afterwards attend
 Willing comrades, when war shall come,
 May stand by their chief; by deeds of praise shall
 25 In every tribe a hero thrive !
 Then Scyld departed at the hour of fate,
 The warlike to go into his Lord's keeping :
 They him then bore to the ocean's wave,
 His trusty comrades, as he himself bade,

30 Whilst with words ruled the friend of the Scyldings,
 Beloved land-prince: long wielded he power.
 There at haven stood with curvéd prow,
 Icy and ready, the prince's barque:
 The people laid their dear war-lord,
 35 Giver of rings, on the deck of the ship,
 The mighty by the mast. Many treasures were there
 From distant lands, ornaments brought;
 Ne'er heard I of a keel more comelily filled
 With warlike weapons and weeds of battle,
 40 With bills and byrnies! On his bosom lay
 A heap of jewels, which with him should
 Into the flood's keeping afar depart;
 Not at all with less gifts did they him provide,
 With princely treasures, than those [friends] did
 45 Who him at his birth had erst sent forth
 Alone over the sea when but an infant.
 Then placed they still a golden standard
 High over his head, let the waves bear
 Their gift to the sea; sad was their soul,
 50 Mourning their mood. Men indeed cannot
 Say now in sooth, hall-possessors,
 Heroes under heavens, who that load received!"

The introductory canto is not well suited to give the general reader a good idea of the poem. It lacks action, and is but part of a general introduction extending to about two hundred lines, which is considered by Köhler and Müllenhoff as a later addition; but we could not expect the poet to plunge *in medias res*, and he prepares our minds gradually for the great contest with Grendel. Lack of space forbids a quotation from this exciting episode, lines 665-836 (section V in Col. Lumsden's translation), and the reader must seek its beauties for himself. Let him turn thence to the fight with Grendel's mother, and lastly to the final struggle with the dragon, whom Beowulf overcomes, but loses his life also. The publication of Col. Lumsden's translation will have the effect, I hope, of turning the minds of the public to this precious heirloom of our forefathers, and of showing that the minstrels in those early days of the Teutonic conquest of Britain sang such poetry as their descendants can well enjoy, and would do well to neglect no longer. It matters little whether in "Beowulf" as in Homer we have one or more lays: suffice it that the perilous adventures of the hero serve as a connecting link to bind the lays into one whole, notwithstanding the digressions, and to illustrate the poetic talent of the poet, or poets, who enlivened the feasts of ancient days, and whose productions are a substantial evidence of the literary culture to which our Anglo-Saxon ancestors had attained.

J. M. G.

Nubische Grammatik, mit einer Einleitung über die Völker und Sprachen Afrika's, von R. LEPSIUS. Berlin, 1880. 8vo, pp. [xii] cxxvi, 506.

This grammar of the Nubian language is the fruit of long-continued studies on the part of its distinguished author. Its beginning dates back nearly forty years, to his memorable expedition to Egypt and Ethiopia (1842-6), in connection with which his first acquaintance with the language was made, a vocabulary gathered, a book of the New Testament (Mark's Gospel) translated into Nubian, and a collection of native songs (unfortunately afterwards lost) written down. The presence of an educated Nubian in Germany somewhat later (1853) gave the opportunity of continuation and revision. Professor Lepsius does not explain why the publication of his results was delayed for more than twenty-five years longer: we may conjecture that it was owing partly to absorption in his Egyptian studies, and partly to his desire to elaborate the general views as to African race and language laid down by him in the Introduction (126 pages), which to the great majority of readers will be the part of the volume of highest interest, and with which we have especially to concern ourselves here. The grammar itself occupies a little less than two hundred pages, and is most clearly and attractively worked out (we miss in it a designation of the accent of the words given, which might, one would think, have been easily added); then follow sixty pages of texts, and near two hundred of vocabulary (Nubian-German and German-Nubian); and the work closes with an appendix of sixty pages on the dialects of the language, along with a criticism of Reinisch's recent work on the Nubian.

The interest taken by Lepsius in the general problem of African languages has been repeatedly testified before: his "Standard Alphabet" included a detailed account of their phonology, and presented also a classification of them, a forerunner of the more complete classification, with exposition of its grounds in their structure and relations, which the Introduction to this volume contains. The subject is one upon which great discordance of views prevails, even (or especially) among those who have given most attention to it; and it would be premature to regard the questions involved in it as definitely settled until special students shall have worked themselves out to a better agreement respecting them. Within the limited space of even so ample an Introduction to the grammar of a single tongue, Lepsius is of course able to give only a brief sketch of his views and the reasons for them, putting them forth for his contemporaries to criticize from their various points of view; without at all pretending to the knowledge which would enable me to judge them with authority, I desire here to state them succinctly, and to examine their relation to certain general principles of the science of language.

Professor Lepsius rejects, with good reason, the method of classification of human races based on so trivial a characteristic as the shape of the cross-section of their hairs, a method which has been adopted and worked out with learning and ingenuity by Friedrich Müller of Vienna; and, in striking antithesis to this scholar, who advances the somewhat paradoxical doctrine that among the four great African races recognized by him the physical differences are as great as among all the other divisions of mankind, he holds that the various African tribes, including even the Hottentots, are physically one race; pointing out, in addition to the common characteristics usually recognized, a forward-tilted position of the pelvis, setting the upper part of the body more

at an angle with the legs than in other races. The inhabitants, however, of Egypt, and of the countries stretching westward and southward from Egypt, he regards as intruders, of Asiatic descent: he calls them by the customary name, Hamites, and divides them into Egyptian, Libyan (Tuareg and Hausa), and Cushite (Beja, Galla, Somali, etc.); while the Semites (Abyssinian and Arabian), ultimately related with these, are still more recent immigrants from Asia. The Hottentot language, as will be noticed later, is classed as an offshoot from the Cushitic.

As set over against the tongues of these intruders, the disposition of the proper African languages is as follows: Nearly the whole of the southern peninsula of the continent, from 7° or 8° N. L. almost to the Cape, is occupied by the dialects of a single well-marked and compact family, the South African or Zingian or Bantu (Lepsius, following Bleek, prefers the last-named designation, which we will accordingly employ); while a broad band across the centre of the continent where it is widest, an immense border-land, as it were, toward Hamite and Semite, in extent nearly or quite equal to the Bantu territory, contains a mass of varying languages, discordant in structure and vocabulary. To explain this state of things, Lepsius holds and endeavors to prove that the Bantu and the Hamitic (of course, in their older, prehistoric forms) are the original sole factors, and that the zone between them is the diversified product of their collision and mutual influence and mixture.

This generalization of Professor Lepsius is a very grand and attractive one; and if it is or shall be well established, the working-out of the history in detail will be a most important department of the study of language. The leading point of general linguistic science involved is that of the mixture of languages, of the degree and kind of influence which one tongue can and does exert upon another in consequence of contact, along with more or less of mixture of races. If from causes of this character such effects can result as are here assumed, then the views hitherto prevalent must be very considerably modified. This is seen and pointed out by our author, who says (p. lxxxv) that the assumption now generally made, that the vocabulary of one language may indeed in considerable measure pass over into another, but not its grammatical forms and their use, is proved by African linguistics to be a prejudice. It could not, of course, enter into Professor Lepsius's plan to discuss the theoretic point in full within the restricted limits of his Introduction; but it will probably be in general thought that he has passed over it with regrettable brevity, considering its cardinal importance to his theory. An assumption may be summarily dealt with by making a contrary assumption; but the doctrine in question does not appear to be an assumption, but rather a scientific deduction from all the facts of language-mixture, historically authenticated and of unmistakable interpretation, hitherto at command. It is not derived from the mixtures taking place within the limits of a single family alone, like the Indo-European, but from those of tongues of different stock and discordant structure. It seems to accord with the best views obtainable as to the mode of working of the language-forces. It cannot, then, be set aside in a sentence as a mere prejudice. That we are authorized to erect it into a universal law, admitting no exceptions, is by no means claimed.¹ But if it be in truth inapplicable to the peculiar

¹ Some of the points involved have been discussed by the writer in a paper on "Mixture in Language," presented to the Am. Philol. Association, and expected to appear in the latter's Transactions for 1881.

conditions of early African language, the grounds of its inapplicability ought to admit of some sort of demonstration; and till that is furnished, it will be felt to stand as a powerful obstacle in the way of general acceptance of a theory involving its rejection, and will compel the inquiry whether, after all, some other theory may not be found capable of explaining the facts in question.

The method by which our author proposes to establish his view as to the genesis of the intermediate band of heterogeneous languages is to set up a certain list of leading particulars in which the Bantu and Hamitic tongues differ, and by these to test the others, ascribing the various agreements and disagreements to the influence of the one or of the other combining element. This method is not without its uncertainties. Every door must be either shut or open; with regard to any given peculiarity, every dialect must either possess it or be without it; and hence it is always possible to take the differences of two tongues, and to find that certain other tongues arrange themselves on the side either of the first or of the second as regards each point of difference. It is not by any means denied that valuable truth may be brought to light by such a comparison; we have only to be careful not to look upon it as a demonstration; that character can be given to it only by the whole complex of conditions involved: as, the circumstances of locality (which here are evidently altogether in favor of Lepsius's theory), the number and importance of the criteria, and, above all, the question whether they are explainable by the cause alleged, or are not plausibly explainable by any other.

From among the mass of differences that distinguish Hamitic and Bantu speech, Professor Lepsius makes a selection of twelve as test-points or criteria. They are, in brief statement, as follows: 1. The use in Bantu of classificatory prefixes to the nouns, in singular and plural, dividing them into so many classes, or declensions, or genders, on a basis of resemblances and differences not now clear, though still apparently in some measure traceable. This is the most fundamental item in the well-known peculiarity of the South-African as prevailingly prefix-languages (the use of suffixes, however, being not entirely wanting), while the Hamitic agrees with nearly all the other families of the globe in having its external structure made almost exclusively by suffixes. With this stands closely connected, 3. the use of noun-making prefixes in the languages of the middle zone, against that of suffixes in Hamitic; and a part of the same general style of structure are, 4. the use of prefixed or of suffixed pronominal endings in the verbs of the two languages respectively; 5. that of prefixes accordant with those of the noun-form, added in Bantu to the words agreeing with the leading noun, making a sort of alliterative concord, of course wanting in Hamitic; and 6. that of prepositions in Bantu, but of postpositions in a part of the Hamitic tongues, namely the Cushite; for the Egyptian and Libyan have also prepositions. Further, 9. the object following the verb is in Bantu, but not in Hamitic, anticipated by a pronominal element prefixed to the verb after the subject, somewhat after the familiar manner of the incorporating or polysynthetic languages. Again, as regards the order of elements in the sentence: 7. the Bantu genitive stands after the governing noun, the Hamitic genitive either before (Cushite) or after (Egyptian and Libyan); and, 8. the Bantu verb comes always between its subject and object, while the Hamitic regularly either begins or ends the sentence (but it is pointed out later, on p. 1, that the Bantu verb-position is shared also by the Libyan branch of Hamitic).

Yet again, as regards phonetic form: 10. a Bantu syllable generally ends with a vowel, or with only a nasal after the vowel, while no such rule applies to the Hamitic; and 11. Bantu words and syllables often take a prefixed consonantal, especially nasal, element, viewed by our author as generally the relic of a former complete syllable. Then, 12. he claims as belonging originally to all the negro-languages the use of tones, like those of Chinese and the other monosyllabic tongues—that is to say, of differences of pitch and modulation applied to express material differences of meaning; he mentions in detail the authorities on which the acceptance of this element rests, as well as those (more numerous) who have overlooked or denied it: nothing of the sort, of course, occurs in Hamitic (although one authority thinks he finds it in Hausa). Finally is to be noted the criterion given in the series as 2: namely, the discordance in regard to gender-distinction founded on sex, which is present in Hamitic, but wanting in Bantu.

There is evidently considerable difference among these points in regard to their authority and value as criteria. Thus, the 12th, the element of significant tone, cannot well be much relied on until the grammarians of African languages shall have come to a better agreement with reference to its occurrence and its nature. A characteristic of so well-known and long cultivated a tongue as Zulu, for example, which is unrecognized by Grout and Doehne, and rests only upon the authority of Endemann, cannot but be regarded with suspicion. And the more, since the character of African, and especially of South-African, language is very different from that which is generally believed to have led the Chinese and other structureless languages to press this element into the service of their vocabulary: as our author himself says (p. lxix), it "has for its sole object, in all the languages in which it occurs, to increase the means of differentiation"—and here, certainly, there is no lack of other means to that end. Then again, not much stress, it would appear, can be laid upon the 6th and 7th and 8th points—the place of prepositions, of governed "genitives," and of verbs in the sentence—since respecting them the Hamitic tongues themselves are not agreed: not to speak of the freedom and variety of arrangement prevailing among dialects of the same stock elsewhere in the world, and the obvious possibility that usage as to such matters should admit of variation by the processes of natural growth and change in African language, as it has in Asiatic and European. Nor, once more, does it seem as if such phonetic differences as form the subject of the 10th and 11th points might not well enough be developed, without foreign interference, in languages of common descent (look, for example, at the great difference between Italian and French as regards admitted finals or initial sibilant with mute, or between Sanskrit and Prakrit as regards the general complexity of syllabic structure). The former of the two is of least consequence; the putting on of a prefixed nasal might be more deeply characteristic; but if this nasal be in fact the relic of a former complete initial syllable, it would only constitute an item under the comprehensive head of prefixed elements. There remain, accordingly, as of probably highest value, the two matters of prefix- or suffix-structure, and of the absence or presence of sexual gender-distinction. These we will proceed to consider more fully.

The character of prefix-language belongs in a more marked degree to the Bantu than to any of the tongues of the middle zone, while in many of the

latter it is entirely wanting. Only the Bantu has that intricate system of distinction of noun-classes, and of their singulars and plurals, by different syllables added at the beginning, which syllables then have their correspondents in the qualifying and predicative words that follow, making an alliterative concord which is one of the curiosities of human expression, and is often illustrated.¹ In other languages (e. g. Efik, Ibo, Yoruba), there is an equally prevalent use of noun-prefixes, but they are rather of the nature of general derivative elements, not class-making or generic. Yet others (Temne, Bullom) use their prefixes to make a much less distinct and elaborate classification of objects, hardly more than a division into animate and inanimate. The most remarkable variation, however, is presented by the Pūl (Fulbē), which uses suffixes in the manner and office of the Bantu prefixes; but, in addition, it has its nouns begin only with consonants, and often varies these initial consonants after the manner of prefixes (thus, *p-ūl-o*, sing., 'red man,' but *f-ūl-bē*, pl.); whence the natural conjecture is expressed by our author that the initials in question are, after all, concealed or metamorphosed prefixes. And yet further, by a peculiarity which Lepsius calls more striking than anything he has met with elsewhere in language, the initial changes of words signifying human beings are in all respects precisely the reverse of those shown in other words: for example, while *p* of a singular human appellative changes in the plural to *f* (as in the word instanced above), and singular *f* remains unchanged, the singular *f* of an animal or thing changes in the plural to *p* (thus, *f-itta-ndu*, 'soul,' to *p-itta-li*), and singular *p* is permanent. The Wolof (it is believed, nearly related with Pūl) has also the variability of initial consonants, and the same variety of suffixes, only without classifying value. And in both there is alliteration, or at least relative concordance, among words syntactically connected. On the other hand, the Pūl prefixes its personal endings, while the Wolof suffixes them. Once more, the extensive Mande or Mandingo group, with some others, are as devoid of all use of prefixes as are the Hamitic languages themselves.

These are specimens of the great and perplexing variety of structure exhibited by the negro-languages; obviously, there are problems of growth here which will resist for a long time, if not (owing to lack of sufficient recorded evidence) forever, the best attempts of philologists to explain them, even in their main features. The immediate question is, whether we ought to accept as sufficient and satisfactory our author's general reference of them to the shaping influence of contact and mixture with Hamitic-speaking peoples on the part of speakers of Bantu dialects. For myself, I do not feel ready to do this, considering the question, hitherto at least an open one, as to the admissibility of such a cause as producing such effects, and considering the apparently unique nature of the phenomena, regarded as brought about in this way. Languages of diverse kindred and structure have elsewhere in the world

¹ Professor Lepsius's selected example is :

a-BA-ntu b-etu a-BA-hle BA-ya-bonakala, si-BA-tanda,
'people our handsome appear, we them love';

where *ba* is the governing plural prefix to the personal noun *ntu*; the corresponding sentence with the noun in the singular, meaning 'man,' would be :

u-MU-ntu w-etu o-MU-hle u-ya-bonakala, si-MU-tanda.

bordered and interpenetrated one another without any analogous results. Perhaps more of the discordance than our author is inclined to allow is owing to discordant growth out of a less developed general condition, rather than to the break-down and working-over of a fully wrought-out structure like the Bantu. We are accustomed to see the grammatical apparatus of a language ruined, in form or in application, under the influence of mixture with foreign material; and the loss or obscuration of the system of class-prefixes, of alliterative concordance, and so on, involves nothing strange or unexpected; but the elaboration of the Pūl grammar out of the Bantu or its like, under a Hamitic pressure, seems unaccountable without the admission of very powerful growing and changing forces in the Pūl itself. I do not know what authorizes us to admit that processes of inflection or derivation, or modes of construction, are ever taken directly out of one language into another; or that foreign materials can be worked even secondarily into linguistic structure, except where the receiving language is in a plastic state, making new formations of its own. In tongues of agglutinative style and habit, we must be careful not to limit too narrowly the capacities of new production; and a notable example of their work in Africa, in the recent establishment of a *quasi* gender-distinction in certain tongues, will be pointed out a little further on.

It may even be questioned whether we do not attribute too much importance in a linguistic respect to the wide extension of the Bantu dialects, which gives to the African language-field the aspect of a body of Bantu territory with a frontier—a broad one, to be sure—of heterogeneous speech. Is there, after all, anything in this to prove that the Bantu may not have been originally even as one of the others, and have won afterward its immense spread, by the aid of favoring circumstances, along with superior endowments on the part of its speakers? Such disproportionate growth of one of the members of a group seems neither impossible nor unknown: the Latin in southern Europe is a notable example of it (one depending, to be sure, on an order of forces unknown in Africa); there may be added the Russian in eastern Europe, and the English and Spanish in America. The acceptance of a view like this would, of course, further imply that African language-structure was in its growing stage at the period of separation, and that the present condition of the divided dialects shows the results of the carrying-out of originally common tendencies in varying manner and degree, as well as the deadening of other tendencies and the uprise of new ones—in all which, the influence of contact and mixture with strange speech might have borne its part. Perhaps there is evidence in the languages themselves, when completely mastered, sufficient to show whether such a hypothesis is or is not tenable; but the first impression of the facts so clearly set forth by Professor Lepsius upon my mind, at least, is that of growth, rather than of metamorphosis under pressure; and the coherence of the Bantu dialects, as compared with the discordance of even the more nearly related of the northern tongues, might be taken as an indication of relatively recent divergence.

There remains for consideration one point of very prominent interest and importance, that of sexual gender. As a criterion, this makes a pretty sharp division between the whole body of African languages (except the Hottentot, of which later) and the Hamitic: all the latter distinguish nouns as masculine and feminine; all the former fail to do so. And yet, this failure is not without

one highly curious exception, at least in appearance: a series of dialects on the uppermost Nile (Bari, Oigob, Bongo, Shilluk) have the sex-distinction plainly marked, in article, demonstrative, etc. Lepsius, however, finds that in Oigob the fundamental distinction appears rather to be between what is big, strong, imposing on the one side, and what is little, weak, despicable on the other; the two sexes falling into the respective classes according to the usual method of estimate of a barbarous people. If his apprehension and interpretation of the facts is a correct one, we find in them (as hinted above) a striking evidence of the constructive forces recently inherent in African speech: a little body of languages having wrought out, independently of foreign influence (which even Professor Lepsius does not feel tempted to suggest in this case), a distinction which in most of them bears the aspect of a sexual-gender one; a single dialect alone betraying the more material basis on which it rests. Possibly we have here a pregnant and much-needed hint as to how our own gender may have arisen: if it had its inception in a class-division of other character and wider reach, into which sex entered as only one element, but one that came to be the prominent and to seem the fundamental one, then at least a part of the difficulties surrounding this hitherto insoluble problem in linguistic growth will be eliminated.

Lepsius attributes a more decisive weight to the element of gender-distinction than most students of language are accustomed to do: whether rightly or wrongly, must be left for the future to determine. Thus, its absence from the Nubian, the language forming the special subject of his volume, seems to him (p. lxxii) enough by itself to prove that this dialect is African and not Hamitic, although in all his other test-points its character is Hamitic. And yet we have in our own Indo-European family a familiar example, the Persian, of a language that has totally lost its old system of genders. Again, it is especially because the Hottentot has genders that our author classes it with full confidence as a tongue of Hamitic origin. His view is, that the race who speak it became separated from the mass of Hamites in the north-east by the crowding outward of the South African or Bantu peoples, and was gradually driven southward and westward, becoming at the same time so mixed with negro elements of population as at last to lose entirely its primitive physical type and assume one that is even exaggeratedly African, with the exception of a more reddish tinge of color. At the same time, no correspondences of material are to be traced between the Hottentot and any of the Hamitic dialects, which would be a natural enough result of such a history; and, while such formative elements as it has are suffixed and not prefixed, it is almost purely monosyllabic: which, again, so far as can be seen at present, may be a consequence of reduction from earlier fulness, in accordance with our author's opinion, instead of constituting an original characteristic, as some others have maintained. What is more extraordinary, now, than anything else is that the specific signs of gender—namely, *b* for masculines and *t* and *s* for feminines—are identically the same in Hottentot and in Beja, a Cushitic dialect of Hamitic, and nearly related with those of the other Hamitic dialects. Lepsius puts this correspondence prominently forward, but does not appear to insist upon it as an absolute demonstration of the truth of the claimed relationship. And, as would seem, with good reason. For it were hard to tell which should be deemed more incredible: that such a correspondence should be accidental merely, having no

historical basis; or that the Hottentot signs should be in truth the inherited counterparts of those of the Beja, kept safe and unaltered, in spite of the wearing out of all the rest of the Hamitic structure, the total transformation of the vocabulary, and the thorough Africanization of even the physical type of the race. Either alternative seems impossible of acceptance; and one might well hesitate before pronouncing the former the harder of the two.

Yet again, Lepsius pronounces (p. xxvi) their agreement in the item of gender-distinction a sufficient evidence that Indo-European, Semitic, and Hamitic are branches of one and the same original stock. Now it is certainly a very striking fact that these three great light-complexioned races, leaders one after another in the world's civilization, and probably enough deriving their origin from the same quarter of the globe, are the only ones (with the exception, to be sure, of the Hottentot and the Oigob and its kin !) to have established gender as an element of their grammar; and I would not venture categorically to deny that its best explanation may one day be found to lie in their original unity; but I cannot at present think it probable—much less, already proved. Gender has altogether the aspect of a distinction gradually established in the course of structural growth, and not dating back to that structureless stage in which, if anywhere, the unity of these three great divisions of human speech must have lain. The whole subject is, to be sure, rather too imperfectly comprehended to allow of our maintaining this with dogmatism; but dogmatism on the other side is also just as much forbidden. Lepsius speaks (p. xxiv) of "frequent enough" traces in Indo-European of the original feminine sign *t* in the "softened feminine *s*," and, without change, in the neutral *t* or *d* of the pronouns, and elsewhere. What he may be keeping back that occurs "elsewhere" cannot well have its importance estimated; but it ought, in order to have any real value, to be decidedly better than that which he quotes: I do not know what a "feminine *s*" is, nor how the neuter-ending *d* of half-a-dozen pronominal stems can witness in favor of a primeval general feminine *t*.

Our author endeavors to support his opinion by establishing a psychological or moral basis for the generic classes of the African languages and the sexual genders of the three white families respectively. Noticing (p. xxi) that, among the more or less indistinct and confused divisions of objects made by the former device, those of human beings and other creatures, or of persons and things, are best maintained, and in many of the languages the only ones left, he conjectures the ground of them "to lie in the position of individuals of the oldest uncultivated races with reference to surrounding Nature. The animal world and the whole of Nature with its superior forces assumed toward man an impossibly hostile attitude; against their ever-present threatening he found aid and protection only in his fellow-men. Hence the importance which he lays upon the rapid and distinct designation of each object according to its friendly, hostile, or indifferent relation to himself." I must confess myself unable to appreciate the force of this argument. Lepsius holds the Bantu system of classes to be the original one, of which the others are wrecks and remnants; and it, certainly, is in no working order for such a defensive purpose, nor does it show signs of ever having been an efficient weapon. If human beings and all the other objects, of whatever class, have their distinctive names, how will even a sudden warning against, for instance, a hostile lion or thunderbolt be quickened by fastening to the name of it a class-sign that

shows it not to be a human being? Can any one imagine a practical way of putting our own *who* and *what* to use after such a fashion? Moreover, nature is full also of useful and helpful objects of every class, inanimate and animate; and, after all, a man's worst foes, as well as his nearest allies, are they of his own species: a pronominal distinction between friend and enemy, or fellow-tribesman and stranger, would be worth much more than all this intricate and mixed-up system of classes. Finally, the wild beasts and other products and phenomena of Asia are at least not less formidable than those of other continents, and the Asian man needed as much grammatical assistance in making head against them as the African.

The other side, however, of Professor Lepsius's theory is intended to explain the discordance between African classes and Asiatic genders. He points out (p. xxiv) that the three gender-races have been, and are likely always to continue to be, the leading ones in human history: in fact, the only "historical" ones. It is not, he thinks (p. xxvi), to be disputed "that all race-capacity of higher development must proceed from a deepened moral basis, which in great part, if not mainly, finds its expression in the family. But it is especially the distinction and division of the sexes, and their prevailingly moral regulation and antithesis in marriage, on which the family rests." And here is the desired psychological foundation for grammatical gender. "The collective race-mind, which is always faithfully reflected by language, was so dominated by this [sexual] mode of contemplating things as to transfer it from human beings to the whole of surrounding Nature, and to divide between the two sexes all her individualized and designated phenomena."

This argument also seems to lie open to the charge of fancifulness. That the higher endowment of the successful races in their first barbarous stages expressed itself in any measure by conformity to our present laws of morality is not easily to be credited; it appeared rather in an intellectual superiority which enabled them to find out and gradually incorporate in arts and institutions (of course, not without the aid of favoring circumstances) whatever would tend to their material advancement. The virtues that make for progress are different at different periods of progress. The sexual morality of that period when Hamite, Semite, and Indo-European were members of one society (supposing that this was ever the case) would be likely to please us as little in the contemplation as their respect for the rights of property and life outside their own tribal limits, or their treatment of the old and infirm. Nor is it clear that the due organization of the family has anything to do with grammatical gender. No language fails to be a gender-language so far as concerns human beings, and also all other creatures in whom the distinction of sex is a notable and practically important one. Every known tongue incorporates in words its apprehension of the distinction between man and woman, father and mother, son and daughter, brother and sister, and so on, and can proceed without linguistic obstacle to construct its laws as to the relations of the sexes in such form as its changing and developing sense of what is conducive to welfare, and therefore right, shall at any time dictate. There is no difference in this respect between Semite and African and Mongol and Polynesian, any more than between the Frenchman, to whom everything is either masculine or feminine, the German, who has also a neuter which he cannot explain (he ranks 'woman' and 'child' under it), the Englishman, who says *he* and *she*, but only when he means actual

persons, and the Persian, who cannot do even that. The very essence of a gender-language is, not that it distinguishes the sexes, but that it treats also every sexless thing as if sexual, and classifies it accordingly. This seems to many a kind of homage paid to the sexual distinction, a testimony to the power of its moral control over the mind; but it may with more plausibility be claimed to be the very opposite—an attenuation and effacement of all distinctive meaning in sex, by assuming it artificially and falsely in the innumerable cases where it does not exist at all. Just so, it would hardly evidence a controlling sense of the profound difference between good and evil to call trees good and their fruit evil, doors good and windows evil, eyes good and noses evil, and so on through the whole universe; or a sense for form to class goodness and headaches as round, and birds and the weather as square; or a sense for color to attribute redness to souls and verbs, blueness to noises and nouns, and yellowness to countries and prepositions. The keenest and most ever-present apprehension of color, it should seem, would be testified by giving colored names to things that possess color, and to no others, noting the absence as well as the presence and varieties of the element. Finally, it is a telling fact, which should not be left out of sight in discussions as to gender, that the most central sexual words in our own family of languages, those in which the moral value of the distinction ought especially to show itself—namely, the words of relationship *father*, *mother*, *sister*, *brother*, *daughter*—have no gender-character of their own, but are made with the same suffix and share the same declension.

On the whole, our author's treatment of the subject of gender, though highly ingenious and full of suggestiveness, does not seem to bring us to any definite and satisfactory result. The distinction still remains, to all appearance, one of the accidents of speech, having no moral character, any more than belongs to a dual number or an instrumental case, of problematic origin, and obscure in its bearings until it shall be better understood.

We may remark, in leaving the subject, that to Professor Lepsius the clear retention in Hamitic of the signs of both genders, while Semitic has lost the separate masculine sign, and Indo-European mainly both, seems (p. xxvii) "one of the many indications that the Hamitic stem first left the primæval home, next the Semitic, and finally the Japhetic." This is in direct and refreshing antithesis to the view still widely held, that, because the Aryan (Indo-Iranian) branch of our own family has retained on the whole more that is primitive in its speech than the other branches have done, therefore the spot where we find it at the dawn of history must be close to the original home of the family. Elsewhere, however (p. xxiv), we are told that "no one questions that locally the original abode of the three families was in Asia, and in or near the Mesopotamian plains, and that they accordingly had a common point of dispersion." The author seems hardly justified in ignoring to this extent the large and respectable party (if not a majority) of linguistic scholars who are unconvinced of the relationship of these families, and of whom some have set up other definite theories as to the place of Indo-European unity, fixing it in Europe or even in Africa, while some, like myself, have endeavored to show that no conclusion whatever respecting the matter can be drawn from the character and distribution of the dialects constituting the family.

Lepsius utterly refuses (p. cvi) to admit alongside these three great historical and cultivated races a fourth, of so-called Turanian or Ural-Altaic connection, which should have laid in Mesopotamia (as Accadians, Sumerians, or whatever else we may call them) the foundation of culture afterward built upon successively by Semites and Indo-Europeans. He believes the Egyptians to have been the originators of that civilization, and the Cushites the intermediaries by whom it was carried eastward. The grounds of his belief he hardly more than hints at, but his name and fame lend it, as mere expression of opinion, a degree of authority; it is to be hoped that he will some time take occasion to discuss the subject more fully.

There are other matters either laid out or touched upon in this most interesting work, which, for lack of space, must be left unreported here. So, especially, the history of the Cushites and their place in ancient civilization: a theme upon which, as every one knows, a vast deal of nonsense has been written, but which by Lepsius is reduced to sober and distinct historic form. Whether the main question treated by him, that of the relationship of African languages, shall or shall not prove to have been finally settled by his researches, he will at any rate be found to have contributed greatly to its settlement, by gathering and marshalling the evidences, and opening up lines of inquiry that shall lead to the discovery of the truth.

W. D. WHITNEY.

Qua in re *Hymni Homerici quinque majores inter se different antiquitate vel Homeritate investigavit J. R. S. STERRETT, Ph. D. Dissertatio inauguralis Monacensis. Boston: Ginn & Heath, 1881.*

Dr. Sterrett has done well in publishing, after the German fashion, his dissertation, for it is a real addition to the existing helps for the study of the Homeric hymns. We find, it is true, some things not quite to our mind. We wish he had not changed the old order of the hymns, and that the proof-reading had been more careful. We wish he had seen Berthold Suhle's essay on the Hymn to Aphrodite (Program of the Gymnasium at Stolp, 1877-8) and considered his arguments for a late date of that hymn. We wish he had weighed more carefully the suggestions of Windisch's Dissertation (1867), that the recognition of the digamma in the Hymns is due to the use of Homeric formulas and that therefore it does not furnish a sure criterion of their relative dates. But, in spite of these qualifications, we heartily welcome and commend this little book. The collections, in the prolegomena, of non-Homeric words and collocations of words are valuable, but the most useful part of the book in our judgment is the text of the five Hymns, in which, by a difference of type, the reader is enabled to see as he reads the number and character of the phrases borrowed from the Homeric poems, for each of which a reference is given in the footnotes. This device, which we do not remember to have seen adopted before, makes the book useful even to advanced students.

L. R. P.

REPORTS.

JOURNAL ASIATIQUE, 1881.

Janvier. 1. *La poëtesse Fadhl, scènes de moeurs sous les khalifes Abbassides*, par M. Cl. Huart. M. Huart has collected from *Kitab el Aghāni*, *Masudi* and other sources a number of anecdotes illustrating the court-life under Motawakkil, who ascended the throne A. H. 232 (A. D. 845)—a compound of great literary brilliancy and unbounded licence of manners. To the earnestness of the early Califs succeeded the luxury and debauchery of the Abbassides, under whom begins the decadence of poetry. The centre of the brilliant circle of improvisatori and wits at Bagdad was the poetess Fadhl, a native of Yemam, a province of Central Arabia, a sort of *Ninon de l'Enclos* presiding over a Hotel Rambouillet.

2. *Essai sur les inscriptions du Safa*, par M. J. Halévy. (Suite.) The first report of the inscriptions at Safa, in the volcanic district east of Damascus, was made by the English traveler Graham in 1857. In 1860 Wetzstein copied 260 of the inscriptions, of which he published ten with the suggestion that they were the work of Sabean tribes who had come to this region from southern Arabia during the first centuries of the Christian era, which view was adopted by de Vogüé. Decipherment of the inscriptions was first attempted by Dr. O. Blau in 1860 (ZDMG, XV, 3), on the supposition that the language was identical with the Arabic, and the alphabet similar to the Sinaitic or Nabatean and the Numidian-Berber or Libyan. In reply to this Professor D. H. Müller of Vienna (ZDMG, XXX, 514) pointed out that the language was Sabean or Himyaritic, and that the Phoenician alphabet must be largely used in the determination of the value of the characters. Halévy holds that Müller, in consequence of erroneous suppositions as to the contents of the inscriptions, and by assuming too complete identity of the language with the Sabean of southern Arabia, failed to reach satisfactory conclusions. Halévy himself began the study of the inscriptions in 1872, dropped it from paucity of materials, resumed it in 1877 when de Vogüé published a large number of inscriptions in his *Syrie centrale*, Paris, 1868-1877, and his first article appeared in the *Journal Asiatique*, 1877, No. 3; the next year he gave the substance of this in the ZDMG, XXXII, 167. In dissent from Professor Müller he maintained that the Safa alphabet though very much like the south Arabian Sabean, yet differed from it in some points, that the two were independent members of the same family, and that the language was related in a similar way to the Himyaritic, and, against Wetzstein and de Vogüé, that the inscriptions were not made by immigrants from the south, but by a native population. In his first article he undertook to determine the characters, and the language, and translate a number of the inscriptions. The present article continues the translation, giving de Vogüé's numbers 156-230, all of which are short, consisting, according

to Halévy, except in one or two cases, of the formula: "by A., son of B.;" a few times is added "prayer," or, "in memory of," but without mention of the name of any deity. The inference would thence be that these inscriptions are by Christian Arabs, such as the Ghassanites, since in the south Arabian inscriptions the name of some god is commonly given. Halévy's acute investigations have greatly advanced the decipherment.

Nouvelles et Mélanges. M. Barbier de Meynard speaks favorably of the third edition of Mallouf's *Dictionnaire Français - Turc*, Paris, 1881, brought out with numerous additions, after the author's death, by Saghirian, and revised by Batifaud. The book, he says, though, like most works of the sort prepared in the East, deficient in scientific method, is a very valuable aid to the acquisition of spoken Turkish. B. M. also notices the first number of the *Revue des Études Juives*, the organ of the Société des Études Juives established two years ago for the investigation of the history and literature of Judaism. Among the contributors to the *Revue* are J. Derenbourg, H. Derenbourg, Halévy and Darmesteter; from such names we may hope, with the reviewer, that the new society will avoid Jewish exclusivism, and do good service to oriental studies. M. Siouffi, French vice-consul at Mosul, makes a report of an Arabic Nestorian MS. containing biographies of the patriarchs from Mur Mari, A. D. 49, to the 79th and last, Yabalaha III, who died A. D. 1318. M. Siouffi gives an annotated translation of the sketch of Yabalaha's life, which is interesting from its testimony to the importance of the Christian clergy and the civil and religious power of the patriarchs in the time of the Mongol Kans.

Février-Mars. 1. Étude sur les inscriptions de Piyadasi, par M. Senart. This fifth article gives the thirteenth and fourteenth edicts, the former in the Khālsi, Kapur di Giri and Girnar texts, the latter in the Girnar, Dhauli, Jaugada, Khālsi, and Kapur di Giri, with commentary and translation. The thirteenth relates to the conquest of Kalimīqā by Piyadasi, declares that the king feels lively grief at the destruction of life incident to the war, and especially at the injuries inflicted on brahmans and cramanas, that he desires security and peace for all creatures, and finds his pleasure and contentment in these conquests of religion, yet attaches no great value to such contentment, but only to what bears fruit for the other life—he has engraved this inscription that his descendants may think only of the conquests of religion. Among his subjected neighbors are mentioned Antiochus, king of the Yavanas, and to the north of him, Ptolemy, Antigonus, Magas and Alexander. The fourteenth edict is merely a brief statement of the fact that the king has made these inscriptions. The subscription of the Girnar edicts Senart renders: "This white elephant is in truth the benefactor of the whole world," the elephant being a symbol of the Buddha; his conjecture is based on the figure of the elephant of Khālsi, with the legend *gajatame*, which he translates "the great elephant." An appendix gives a collation of a photographic proof, recently taken at Girnar with his transcription of the facsimiles of the survey—the differences, he thinks, do not affect his analyses.

2. Une inscription de l'époque Saïte, par M. Karl Piehl. The text of the inscriptions on the statuette A 84 of the Louvre Museum, published before by Sharpe in his *Egyptian Inscriptions*, and by Greene in his *Fouilles exécutées à*

Thèbes, is here given with annotated translation by Mr. Piehl (of Upsala), who compares with it Ebers's rendering of some nearly identical texts on another statuette. The content is chiefly laudation of the inscriber Harūa, who lived in the time of the princess Ameniris and a king whom Piehl supposes to be her husband Pianchi. One of the most interesting of Harūa's titles is "head of the house of the priests of the *ka*," which seems to indicate that there was in the necropolis an organized corporation of priests of the *ka*, the man's double, or less material counterpart of the body.

3. *Essai sur les inscriptions du Safa*, par M. J. Halévy. (Suite.) The author discusses de Vogüé's numbers 231-384, of which the contents are similar to those above described.

Nouvelles et Mélanges. *Chronique littéraire de l'extrême Orient*, par M. C. Imbault-Huart. 1. The college of Occidental languages and science established by the Chinese government at Peking in 1861, now under the direction of the American Dr. W. A. P. Martin. The course of eight years comprises the English, French, Russian and German languages, geography, history, arithmetic, algebra, geometry, trigonometry, differential and integral calculus, physics, chemistry, astronomy, mineralogy and geology, theoretical and practical mechanics, navigation, anatomy, economics, and international law. To the college are attached a library and reading-room, a chemical laboratory, a museum of mineralogy, etc., and a printing establishment. General examinations are held every three years. Pupils of this school are now attached to the Chinese legations at London, Paris, Washington, Tokio, Berlin, and St. Petersburg. 2. Playfair's recently published Chinese Geographical Dictionary. This is merely a reimpres-
sion of Biot's dictionary, with some improvements. It adopts the incon-
venient orthographic system of Wade, instead of giving the southern mandarin
pronunciation, and its omissions of names of places and explanations are
numerous. Nevertheless it will not be useless to sinologues. 3. Recent works
on Confucianism and Tauism. Mr. Chaloner Alabaster's "Occasional papers
on Chinese philosophy, No. 6, The Chinese Bible" is worthy of study. He
remarks properly that the name "Classics" is misleading—the books so-called
are really sacred books, and the King and the Shu may fairly be represented
as the Chinese Old Testament and New Testament respectively. "Non
Christian religious systems. Confucianism and Tauism," London, 1879, by R.
K. Douglas, of the British Museum and Professor of Chinese in King's College,
is an instructive little volume. Further may be mentioned "A guide to the
tablets in a temple of Confucius," by consul T. Watters, Shanghai, 1879, and
"Introduction to the science of Chinese Religion, a critique of Max Müller
and other authors," by Rev. E. Faber, Hongkong, 1880. 4. The publications
of the Jesuit Mission of T'chiang nann. These comprise a Chinese language-
course, and the first issue of a collection of memoirs on natural history, treat-
ing, among other things, of the silkworm, and the typhoon of July 31, 1879.
Published at Shanghai. 5. Helps to the study of spoken Chinese. P. G. von
Möllendorff's "Praktische Anleitung zur Erlernung der hochchinesischen
Sprache," Shanghai, 1880, is an excellent manual, full and judicious. 6. Works
on Corea. Ross's "History of Corea, ancient and modern," Paisley, 1880,
favorably received by the English press, is a valuable book in spite of its
inaccurate orthography. Ernest Oppert, in his "A forbidden land: Voyages to

the Corea," London, 1880, praises the people and their climate and soil, and speaks well of the work of the Catholic missionaries. To his book is added a Corean dictionary, by Hoffman. 7. Mr. H. A. Giles's "Strange Stories from a Chinese Studio," London, 1880, is a very commendable translation of a part of the famous Chinese story-book, the *Leao chaï che y*, composed in the 17th century of our era, and first published in the 18th, on which see his Introduction. Mrs. Gray's "Fourteen months in China" offers nothing new, but will be useful to the many readers who know nothing at all of that country. M. J. Acheson has prepared a useful "Index to Dr. Williams's Syllabic Dictionary." 8. Various photo-lithographed works issued by the director of the Shanghai Gazette. An English-Chinese pocket-dictionary, the first of the sort, and perhaps very useful, only one must know the language in order to use it; phrase-book from Morrison's dictionary; Morrison's dictionary, in one volume octavo; a Lexilogus, a Business-letter writer, and a Speaker; the Chinese "Panorama of Peking on the Emperor Kang-he's 60th birthday," and a Chinese atlas of China. 9. Works on Japan. "Young Japan," Yokohama, 1880, by J. R. Black, editor of various magazines in Japan, is a history of the marvellous revolution of thought and custom that that country has undergone. The first volume has appeared; it is to be hoped that the second will follow soon. Wm. Bramsen has published valuable "Japanese chronological tables," Tokio, 1880, A. D. 645-1873. 10. The third volume of Father Zottoli's admirable *Cursus litteraturae sinicæ* has just appeared. Other works are announced. M. C. de Harlez notices very favorably the "Pahlavi Gujarati and English Dictionary" of Jamaspji Destur Minocheherji, fellow of the University of Bombay, of which vols. I and II have appeared, and vol. III is announced. The missionary Father Leboucq gives in his "Associations de la Chine," published at Paris, a very curious picture of a little known side of Chinese life, namely its societies political, secret, religious, philanthropic, financial, etc.

C. H. Tov.

Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft. XXXIV Band, IV Heft, 1880.

1. Der heilige Agastya nach den Erzählungen des *Mahābhārata*. Von Adolf Holzmann. The legends of Agastya, Holtzmann thinks, rest on historical recollections—he is the type of the first Aryan pioneers in the region south of the Vindhya mountains (thus he goes southward for good, after tricking the Vindhya into a promise not to grow any higher), and in the Deccan he is now one of the most renowned saints, and is regarded as the oldest of ancient teachers. In the M. he is a famous digester (having once swallowed and digested the ocean), hunter, warrior and devotee, and in the later parts of the poem is made superior to the gods. His father is Mitra or Varuna, his mother unnamed, and his wife *Lopāmudrā* of Vidarbha. He plays a prominent part in the history of Nahusha, whom he curses and casts down, and so restores Indra to the throne of heaven.

2. Eine persische Bearbeitung der sufischen Terminologie (*İştilâhât-âşşâfiâ*) des 'Abdurazzâk al-Kâschâni. Von Prof. Dr. Bacher. This Persian translation is contained in a MS. of unknown author and date, in the Breslau city

library, based on one of the Arabic MSS. used by Sprenger (and marked by him Ayin) in his Dictionary of the technical terms of the Sufies, Calcutta, 1845. The translator deals freely with his material, sometimes making great additions in the way of explanations and definitions, more frequently omitting passages of greater or less length (apparently in some cases from dogmatic considerations—he was possibly of the Shiite faith), and scattering verses, grammatical and mystical, throughout his work. He usually retains the Arabic terms, even where they are not technical, introducing only Persian inflections and syntax, so that in many places his work shows itself as a translation only in the connectives (as the substantive verb) and the Persian endings of the individual words. The translation contains many errors.

3. *Karl der Grosse und seine Tochter Emma in Tausend und eine Nacht.* Von Prof. Dr. Bacher. In the story of Nuraddin Ali and Maria the girdle-maker, which fills 200 pages of vol. X of the Breslau edition of the Thousand and One Nights, the heroine is the daughter of the king of France, a contemporary of Harun al-Rashid, who, captured by Muhammedan pirates, marries a Moslem and becomes a devoted adherent of Islam. In spite of various differences, Dr. Bacher finds the basis of this story in the saga of Charlemagne's daughter Emma and Eginhard, which he thinks may easily have been carried to the East in the time of the Crusades in some distorted shape. The religious motive of the tale—the glorification of Islam over against Christianity—is obvious.

4. *Nāṣir Chusrau's Rūšanāināma, oder Buch der Erleuchtung, in Text und Uebersetzung, nebst Noten und kritisch-biographischem Appendix.* Von Prof. Dr. Hermann Ethé. III. For notices of previous numbers of this translation, in vols. XXXIII and XXXIV of the *Zeitschrift*, and an account of the author, see vol. I, Nos. 2 and 4 of the *Journal*. In this number the poet denounces evil company, slander, the present world and poetry, and enjoins silence and prayer.

5. *Le livre de la félicité, par Nāṣir ed-Din ben Khosroū.* Par Edmond Fagnan. As complementary to Dr. Ethé's publications of Nasir's works, Mr. Fagnan offers this little poem taken from the collection in No. 781 A of the Persian Supplement in the Bibliothèque Nationale. Text and translation are given, with various readings furnished by Dr. Ethé. The contents of the poem are similar to those above described. The author counsels moderation, makes little of kings and chiefs, and much of artisans and laborers, and especially of prophets, saints, and sages.

6. *Phönische Miscellen.* Von Dr. Paul Schroeder. 1. An unedited inscription from Kition in Cyprus, on a marble block, discovered in making the causey from Larnaka to Levkasia. It consists of two lines, of 32 and 15 letters respectively, and is rendered by Schroeder: "This monument (dedicated) to Eshmun-Odoni Sardal son of Abdmelkart son of Reshefyathon, interpreter of the ambassadors." The last word, כְּדָבִים, is translated by de Voglē "two thrones," as if from the Aramaic form כְּדָבִי = Heb. כְּדָבִים, which seems less satisfactory than the derivation of Levy, accepted by Schroeder, from the stem כְּדָבִ, which may easily be written in Phoenician כְּדָבִם. The reference would be to the ambassadors of the Persian Great King, to whom Cyprus was subject. The name Sardal does not occur elsewhere in the inscriptions. 2. Three frag-

ments from Kition. 3. Three seals with Phoenician legends. One of these reads: "(Seal) of Abd-yahu, servant of the king," whose possessor, from the divine name Yahu = Yahweh, and from the forms of the letters, Schroeder with probability supposes to have been a Hebrew. The date he assigns, the fifth or sixth century B. C., is less certain. At the end of the number, p. 764, Schroeder reports another inscription from Kition, which he renders: "the keeper of the scales, son of N . . . (erected) this (statue) to his wife." The verb is here feminine, as in *Citiensis* I, and so far supports de Vogüé's opinion that the feminine form of this verb (תַּמְסֵס) is always employed where the figure carved is female. "Keeper of the scales" is the rendering of סַלְמָה, after the Hebrew and Arabic. The characters may, says Schroeder, be read סַלְמָה, in which word we should have to see a non-Semitic proper name.

7. Zwei arabische Papyrus. Beschrieben von O. Loth. (Mit 2 Tafeln in Lichtdruck.) These papyri, obtained by Loth in Cairo, were found in the neighborhood of Madīnat-al-Faiyūm. One of them, dated A. H. 169 (A. D. 785), is a contract of land-rent of the sort called *muzāra'ah*, in which the owner receives a part of the produce. The writing is a well formed cursive, distinguished from the later *Neskhī* by the more archaic character of some of the letters, and almost entirely without diacritical points. The second papyrus is a letter from two Arab women in or near al-Fustāt (old Cairo) to three others in a village of the Faiyūm, confused, wordy, and unimportant. It is not dated, but is probably to be assigned to the second century of the Hejra. The writing, though cursive and in the style of the Magrib, approaches the oldest form of the Arabic alphabet. Some of the grammatical forms resemble those of the modern popular language: the feminine of the second person plural in pronoun and verb is lacking, and the accusative singular of the adjective used adverbially is without the nunation. In the syntactical construction is to be noted the free use of the sign of the accusative, *iyyā*, the peculiar construction of *nīma*, and the retroactive influence of the gender of the *biyān* or determinative of kind on the relative prounoun.

8. Atropatene. Von Th. Nöldeke. In his translation of the book of *Artachšir i Pāpakān*, Nöldeke derives the name Atropatene from that of the satrap Atropates, who declared himself independent after the death of Alexander; to which James Darmesteter (*Revue critique*, 1880, No. 16) objected that this was merely a Greek etymology, that the province had a separate existence before the death of Alexander, and therefore a separate name, and that the modern Persian etymology *adarbigān* = Atarpātakān "the country of the descent of fire" (where Zoroaster received the fire from heaven) is preferable. In defence of his view Nöldeke here quotes the express testimony of Strabo (522 f.) that the district in question was called after the satrap, adduces evidence to show that there was only one Media before the time of Alexander, points out the probability of Atropates's having made himself master of part of it, and shows that from this time on the name Atropatene, never before mentioned, appears in history.

9. Der Kalender des Avesta und die sogenannten Gahanbār. Von R. Roth. This is an examination of the hymns in the Avesta (Westergaard's edition, pp. 318 ff.) devoted to the Gahanbār, thrown out by Westergaard as an interpolation,

and not translated by Spiegel. Roth regards them as a genuine part of the text, and as throwing light on the *kalendar* and home of the old Iranians. He holds the *gahanbār* to be seasons and not festivals, though each had a festival connected with it. The names he explains as follows: *Maidhyōshema*, mid-summer-time, and also midsummer-day, the summer solstice; *Maidhyāiryā*, midwinter and the winter solstice, properly midyear—and midsummer-day, being the 105th of the year, and midwinter-day the 290th (as the *Avesta* states), it follows that the Iranian year originally began March 8th; *Maidhyōzaremya*, midspring, from March 8th to April 21st; *Paitishahya*, the grain-bringing time, from June 20th to Sept. 3d; *Ayāthrima*, the time of return (of the flocks), from Sept. 4th to Oct. 3d; *Ham-a-çpat-maēdhya*, time of strengthening of power, that is, of recreation, rest, from Dec. 23d to March 2d (thence 5 intercalary days to the beginning of the year). He takes *çpat* as present participle of the root *çu* (*äçpat* = *äçuvat*) and adds a section in defence of this derivation. His *kalendar* of the religious feasts he bases on the fact that in each month that day is a feast-day which bears the name of the divinity of the month, as in the month Mithra the day Mithra, the 16th of the month. As to the days of the month, their names are certain, but the order of the names presents great difficulties when the two lists of months and days are compared. While in the latter the order is in general according to the rank of the divinities, in the former the Fravashi come first, and Ormazd has the tenth place. Roth finds the explanation of this apparent anomaly in a sacerdotal year which began with the summer solstice, in which case Ormazd would have really the highest place in the middle of the year, his month being from Dec. 3d to Jan. 1st. The irregular position of the Fravashi and the Tistrya (Sirius) he refers to the existence of traditional festivals in their honor. All the data of climate and land derived from this *kalendar* point, he thinks, to a country of elevated valleys (spring up to April 21st, hay-harvest to June 20, other harvest up to Sept. 1st), to the Oxus-valley, Bactria. In West Iran these conditions would suit only Media, and Media cannot have been the home of the *Avesta*, first because of the intimate linguistic and religious relations between these Aryans and those who occupied the Indus region, and secondly, because the *Avesta* knows nothing of the Magians.

Anzeigen. In a notice of Nöldeke's translation of Tabari's history of the Sasanidae (of which the title is: *Geschichte der Perser und Araber zur Zeit der Sasaniden*, Leyden, 1879), A. von Gutschmid, after pointing out the great value of Tabari's work, and the admirable learning, judgment and insight shown in Nöldeke's annotations and additions, makes a number of critical remarks, full of valuable matter, but too minute to be specially mentioned here. He characterizes Nöldeke's book as the most important preliminary work for this history that has yet been done. Prof. H. Jacobi's "Kalpasūtra of Bhadrabāhu, with an Introduction, Notes, and a Prākrit-Saṃskrit Glossary" (Abhandl. für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, VII, 1), Leipzig, 1879, is reviewed by Hermann Oldenberg. Prof. Jacobi begins his Introduction by offering proof that Buddha was not the only religious reformer of his time, that a probably earlier contemporary of his was the founder of the Jaina sects, the so-called Mahāvira, whose legendary biography makes up the most important part of the

Kalpasūtra, and who was known to the Buddhist texts under the name of Nigantha Nātaputta. He then goes on to discuss the chronology, the year of Mahāvira's death (155 years before the accession of Candragupta), and the list of kings (the main point being that he identifies Udāyin with Kālāçoka), and concludes with an examination of the older Jaina literature, and remarks on Bhadrabāhu, who appears as the author of the Kalpasūtra. Oldenberg rejects the identification of Udāyin and Kālāçoka, and holds that the Ceylon tradition gives the names correctly. He adds a few criticisms on the Glossary. Paul Haupt gives a notice of Dr. Fritz Hommel's "Zwei Jagdinschriften Assurbanipal's, nebst einem Excurs über die Zischlaute im Assyrischen wie im Semitischen überhaupt," Leipzig, 1879. On the Assyriological part of the book he remarks among other things that the author does not always indicate the length of the vowels, that the assumption of original parallel roots is of small advantage, and that the name Astarte does not come from the Sumerian. He holds also that the primitive Semitic did not have distinction of cases. He agrees with the author in the view that the mechanical laws of sound hold in Semitic, as elsewhere, without exception, while he varies from him somewhat in his construction of the Semitic sibilant system. A statement of the positions of Haupt and Hommel is given by Professor Francis Brown, in the *Review*, vol. II, No. 6, to which the reader is referred. Dr. Loth calls attention to the beautiful photo-lithographic reproduction of the Teheran lithograph of Das Buch der Chosroen von Jelaleddin Mirza, which has lately been brought out in Vienna. He recommends it as a Persian Reader. Prof. Wm. Wright of Cambridge corrects an error into which he had unwittingly led Prof. Fleischer. He did not mean that Prof. Nöldeke (instead of Julius Fürst) was the first to explain the etymology of בְּגָדָן (see the *Zeitschrift*, XXXIV, p. 568), but that he was the first to explain rightly the collocation of these letters in the inscription of Carpentras.

1881. I Heft.

The report of the proceedings of the convention of German philologists at Stettin last year gives the opening address of the President of the Oriental section, Prof. Dr. A. Müller—an interesting sketch of the scientific career of Andreas Müller (1630–1694), who was born near Stettin. He is characterized as a man of great activity, but deficient in accuracy and thoroughness. A very curious episode in his life was his announcement of a new and easy method of learning Chinese, whereby he could "within a year (not to say a month or less time) bring even women so far that they could read Chinese and Japanese books, and, so far as they understood the rules, translate them," and his refusal to the end to make his method public.

1. Die Christenverfolgung in Südarabien und die himyarisch-äthiopischen Kriege nach abessinischer Ueberlieferung. Von Winand Fell. For the elucidation of the history of the Ethiopian conquest of southern Arabia Mr. Fell gives an account of three Ethiopic MSS. (Orient. 686, 687 [688], 689) contained in the valuable Magdala-collection of the British Museum, holding Ethiopic reports of native affairs to be entitled at any rate to examination, though they are often of little value. These MSS. he thinks translations from the Arabic; they agree in general with the Greek narratives, but with some peculiarities of

their own. Assuming the conquest of Najrān by the Jewish king Du-Nuwās and the slaughter of the Christians in that city, A. D. 523, as an assured fact of history, Fell endeavors to clear up several other points in the history of the period. His careful and ingenious discussion makes it probable that there were at least two Ethiopian campaigns in south Arabia, the first led by king Ela-Amida, about A. D. 480, the second being that which resulted in the subjugation of Du-Nuwās; and further that the complete christianization of Abessinia was not effected by Frumentius in the 4th century, but only came about gradually, a great step forward having been taken by Ela-Amida. Several minor points also are handled very skilfully by Fell, and no little light thrown on this obscure period, whether or not his conclusions can be accepted as certain. At the end he gives a translation of part of the Ethiopic story, which reads like all these tedious and credulous narratives.

2. Die Grosse Mauer von China. Von Dr. O. F. von Möllendorff, Kais. Deutschem Consularbeamten in China. This is a learned and intelligent examination of the native and foreign authorities on the Great Wall, and a sketch of its history as far as the data permit. The author's results are that the present wall is an entirely different structure from the ancient—the old wall began under the Ju dynasty, in the fourth and third centuries B. C., was continued and enlarged up to the fifth century of our era, after which it fell into neglect till the fourteenth century—it was not continuous, was partly of earth and partly of stone, and was not very formidable. The present wall was built by the Ming dynasty, A. D. 1368-1644. It alone deserves the name of a fortification. But the wall has never been politically of great importance—it never kept out the western tribes, which made their inroads whenever the weakness of the empire gave opportunity. A description of the present condition of the wall and a Chinese bibliography on the general subject are prefixed to the article.

3. Zur Differenz zwischen Juden und Samaritanern. Von Rabbiner Dr. Fürst in Mannheim. In illustration of the parallel developments of Jewish and Samaritan religious and ritualistic ideas Dr. Fürst adduces various anti-Samaritan explanations of Scripture texts by the Aramaic interpreters and in the Talmud. Thus among the five words mentioned in Mekilta (Amalek, 1), Talmud of Babylon (Yoma, 51, b) and elsewhere, as to which it was doubtful, whether they belonged to the preceding or succeeding context, occurs תְּאֵשׁ in Gen. iv, 7. The Septuagint attaches this to the preceding word, rendering: *οὐκ ἐὰν ὄρθως προσενέγκης ὄρθως δὲ μὴ διέληγες ἡμαρτεῖς; γρούχασον*, which supposes the Hebrew: תְּאֵשׁ אָס הַרְשִׁיב שְׁאָתָה וְאָס לְאַתְּ הַרְשִׁיב. This curious reading Fürst explains from a controversy between the schools of Shammai and Hillel. The former held that peace-offerings, with the cutting up of the flesh, were obligatory before the Mosaic legislation, otherwise nobody could lawfully have eaten meat (according to Lev. xvii); this view was favorable to the Samaritans. The Hillelites, on the contrary, held that peace-offerings were unnecessary, and in order that the people might see that the sacrificial ritual began with Moses, Cain is here condemned for dividing the flesh of his sacrifice; Cain, it is true, brought no animal as sacrifice, but the interpreters would not neglect the useful lesson on that account.

4. Bemerkungen zu Bruns-Sachau: "Syrisch-Römisches Rechtsbuch aus dem fünften Jahrhundert." Von Dr. Perles, Rabbiner. Several emendations of text that commend themselves as natural. The explanation of the *καλὴ πρᾶσις* and *κακὴ πρᾶσις* as purchases with and without power of returning the thing bought is supported from the Midrash on Ex. xxxii, 11.

5. Mundhir III und die beiden monophysitischen Bischöfe. Von Ign. Guidi. The patriarch Severus of Antioch, so Theodorus Anagnostes relates, sent two bishops to Mundhir to convert him to the Monophysite faith; but the Arab phylarch covered the messengers with confusion by asking whether the archangel Michael died, and on their replying that it was impossible, showing them that still less could the simple divine nature have died on the cross. Guidi thinks the story doubtful, because it is older than this occurrence, and further is not mentioned by Xenaias in his letter to the monks of Teleda on this very question, written a few years after the alleged embassy; the Arabs also found nothing strange in the Monophysite doctrine, and most of them embraced it.

6. Zur Literaturgeschichte des *chaṭa' al-āmmā*. Von Ign. Goldziher. This is in continuation of the writer's former additions (vol. XXVII, p. 155 of the *Zeitschrift*) to Prof. Thorbecke's bibliography of the literature of Arabian popular grammatical errors. He calls special attention to the value in this regard of Ibn al-Atīr 's *al-mathal al-sā'ir fi 'adab al-kātib wa al-shā'ir*, Bulak, A. H. 1282.

7. Beiträge zur Kenntniss des Avesta. I. Von Chr. Bartholomae. Commentary on *Yaçno* XXVIII, 9, 10, XXX, 11, XXXIII, 1, and the prayer *ā-aryémā-ishiyyō*.

8. Ueber Schem ha-mephorasch. Von Rabb. Dr. A. Nager. Against Dr. Fürst's defence of the view (vol. XXXIII, p. 297 of the *Zeitschrift*) that this expression signifies the distinctly spoken or written divine name. Dr. Nager finds from the literature that it rather means the name that is peculiar to God, expressive of the true God. But the narrative in the Mishna, Sanh. VII, 5, seems to settle the meaning of *וְאֵת*, and Dr. Nager's objections do not appear to be conclusive.

9. Armeniaca. I. Von H. Hübschmann. The article contains various remarks on Armenian inflections, phonology and etymology (often against De Lagarde), a reply to Fr. Müller's statement that modern Persian phonology is very like the Armenian, and a note on Persian eschatology.

10. Bemerkungen zur Theorie des Çloka. Von H. Oldenberg. The Çloka, Oldenberg remarks, has been heretofore examined (admirably by Gildemeister) only as to the metrical laws governing the separate feet; he proposes to inquire whether the several feet may not stand in such connection among themselves, that the metrical form of one determines, within the possible limits, that of the others. For this purpose he has examined the five first books of Manu, and the Sāvitri episode of the Mahābhārata, and gives the results in a table, one of these being that the quantity of the first and last syllables of the pāda is always, that of other first and last syllables almost never, doubtful. He suggests, in explanation of the Indian aversion to the foot in a first or third place, that its constitution, several short syllables leading to a long, rather suits the repose of the end, that is, the second or fourth foot of the half-çloka.

II. Indische Drucke. Von Dr. Joh. Klatt. A list of 140 books edited in India by native Hindu scholars.

Anzeigen. Georg Ebers gives a full outline of Lepsius's *Nubische Grammatik* (Berlin, 1860), with the views of which he agrees in all points—with the unitary character of the African original language, the Asiatic origin of the Hottentots, the Cushite character of the Phoenicians and Hyksos, and the Egyptian origin, through Cushite intermediation, of the Babylonian civilization. The grammatical work proper he commends as a masterpiece. Prym and Socin's "Neuaramäischer Dialect des Tür 'Abdīn," which gives texts and an annotated translation, is reviewed by Nöldeke, who compares the grammar with that of the Urmi-dialect and the old Syriac. With the former it has much in common, and yet the two so greatly differ that a man of Tür (in northeastern Mesopotamia) could not understand a native of Urmi (on lake Urmi in the mountains of Kurdistan). The Tür-dialect has the phonetic degradations and the new inflectional forms that are found in all modern Syriac dialects, and in addition a participle has been made into a perfect of intransitive verbs. The vocabulary contains many foreign words, and many difficulties in other respects. The tales themselves, taken down by Prym and Socin in Damascus from the mouth of a native of Tür, furnish much interesting matter, partly mythical, partly illustrative of the morals of the country. The reviewer highly commends the accuracy of the editors.

C. H. Tov.

ANGLIA. Zeitschrift für englische Philologie. R. P. WÜLCKER und M. TRAUTMANN. IV Band, 1 Heft. Halle, 1881.

A. Schröer opens this number with the longest and weightiest article, on *Die Anfaenge des Blankverses in England*. While dating the prevailing use of blank-verse in drama from the publication of Marlowe's "Tamburlaine" in 1587, he sets to work to study the development of blank-verse from its first appearance to that time. For contemporary views on metre he prizes most highly Gascoigne's "Certayne Notes of Instruction," 1575, considering it much superior to Webbe's "Discourse of English Poetrie," 1586, Puttenham's "Arte of English Poesie," 1589, or Sir Philip Sydney's "Apologie for Poetrie," 1595. He begins naturally with Surrey's translation of the second and fourth books of the *Aeneid*, the first English blank-verse, before 1547, and examines carefully these poems in respect to measurement of syllables of single words, word-accent, and verse-rhythm, the last being strictly the iambic ten-syllable measure, but affected by the introduction of trochees, of additional syllables within the verse, by feminine endings, feminine caesura, mingling of longer and shorter verses, rime, and alliteration. The general result of the examination of Surrey's work, briefly expressed, is that the variations from strict iambic rhythm are due to Middle-English forms of versification, but the influence of the syllabic principle of Romance metre is evident: alliteration plays no important part. It is well to notice what Gascoigne says about this "repeticion of sundrie wordes beginning all with one letter, the whiche (beyng modestly used) lendeth good grace to a verse: but they do so hunte a letter to death that they make

it *crambē*,¹ and *crambē bis positum mors' est*: therefore 'ne quid nimis.' Several examples of a dissyllabic thesis, and its natural accompaniment feminine caesura, are given, but while rightly excluding dactyls and anapaests, it seems to me that the writer makes scarcely sufficient allowance for the expansion and contraction (slurring) of syllables so common in Chaucer, whose influence doubtless was felt by Surrey, as we see the same even in Shakspere, *e. g.* (p. 30), instead of reading 23 as 8-syllable,

That with the *spoil* of my heart did go,
why not make it 10-syllable,

That with the *spoil* of my heart did gó?
and again (p. 31), 131, Schröer reads,

Like to the adder | with *venemous* herbes fed,
which either slurs the second *e* in *venemous* or makes a dissyllabic thesis, for
herbes is dissyllabic, so why not,

Like to the ádd'r with vén'mous hérbes féd?
Again, 113 on pp. 10 and 30 Schröer reads:

By the divine science of *Minerva*,
making a syllable of *e* in *divine* and a feminine ending to the verse. This
sounds peculiarly harsh, especially in view of the rare cases when final *e* in a
Romance adjective forms a separate syllable. I should prefer to read:

By the divine science of *Mínervá*,
even if the Romance accentuation of *science* is not elsewhere found in Surrey
and if he also reads *Minerve* as a dissyllable. Compare *Arcite* and *Arcita* in
Chaucer's *Knights Tale*, to show that the poets used proper names to suit
their verse and were not particularly careful as to their accentuation. Lack
of space will not permit notice of some other lines which I consider exceptionable.

The other works examined are, Grimald's poems in Tottel's 'Miscellany,' 1557, Sackville and Norton's 'Gorboduc,' 1561, Gascoigne and Kinwelmarshe's 'Jocasta,' 1566, Turberville's translation of six of Ovid's Epistles, 1567, Spenser's Fifteen Sonnets in van der Noodt's 'Theatre for Worldings,' 1569, Gascoigne's 'Steele Glas,' 1576, "die erste grösvere, nicht dramatische blankversdichtung nach Surrey's *Virgilübertragung*," which Schröer thinks "of considerable influence"; Barnabe Rich's 'Travailes and Adventures of Don Simonides,' 1584, Lyly's 'Woman in the Moone,' 1584, Peele's 'Arraignment of Paris' and other poems, 1582-5, Greene's 'Description of Silvestro's Lady,' 1587, and lastly Hughes's 'Misfortunes of Arthur,' 1587. An examination of these poems in respect to the points above mentioned shows that the variations from strict iambic rhythm disappear in Surrey's successors, and greater perfection in form appears. Also, blank-verse shows itself at its best in the drama, for which it is specially suited, as the dramatic form favors its free development.

¹ Occidit miseros *crambe* *repetita* magistros. Juv. vii, 154.

The article is a useful contribution to the history of English rhythms, and deserves the attention of English scholars. It proceeds, as all such investigations should proceed, by the inductive method, and numerous examples are given from which the author's conclusions are drawn.

W. Zeitlin institutes a comparison between Shakspere's 'King Henry VIII' and Rowley's 'When you see me, you know me.' Rowley's is the older play, and as Shakspere and Rowley were members of different companies, he thinks Shakspere wrote his play as a rival to Rowley's. Lack of space forbids going into particulars. Suffice it to say that, while Shakspere brings before us Catherine of Arragon and Anne Boleyn, Rowley joins Jane Seymour and Catherine Parr, barely mentioning Anne of Cleves and passing over Catherine Howard. Rowley is also much freer with the history, joining events separated by twenty years, and treating as living personages those long since dead. Both paint alike the characters of Wolsey and Gardiner, but Rowley lets us see more of Henry's private life than Shakspere does. The conclusion is drawn that Rowley strove rather to entertain the public, and this is shown especially in his treatment of the Fool, giving one to Wolsey as well as to the king. Shakspere did not use Rowley's play, but may have been influenced by it. No distinction is made between the parts of Shakspere and of Fletcher in 'Henry VIII,' the articles of Spedding and of Delius being merely referred to in a note.

A. Brandl contributes metrical, grammatical, and critical notes to the Anglo-Saxon poem *Be Domes Dæge*, published by R. Lumby for the Early English Text Society, 1876, with its Latin original, *De Die Judicii*. The poet follows his original closely but not slavishly; the influence of the old epic style is seen; the metre is alliterative, quite pure, and belongs to the close of the Old-English period: the language is pure West-Saxon of the time of Aelfric; some of the variations in forms may be due to the scribe, as the MS. belongs to the end of the 11th century. The article closes with remarks on, and corrections of Lumby's text and notes.

F. Kluge, in *Anglo-saxonica*, thinks *laessa, laest*, should be *læssa, læst*; *oferringan*, Grein II, 318, should be *of erwingan*; *bend* has another form *benn*, which Grein should not have changed; *sweot* should be *sweot*; and *weor*, Andr. 1661, should be *weorc*, as in Jul. 569.

F. H. Stratmann supplies examples of the Paragogic *n*, so common in Layamon, from the Gospels in English of the 12th century.

C. Horstmann continues his Prose-legends with V. S. Antonius (vita, inventio, translatio), from MS. Reg. 17, CXVII, in the British Museum. He gives first the contents of the MS., then remarks on the vocalization and forms, and lastly the full text of the legend. The dialect is the West-Midland, judging by the inflexions, but with Northern vocalization. The MS. belongs to the beginning of the 15th century.

W. M. Baskerville supplies the Anglo-Saxon text of the Epistola Alexandri ad Aristotelem, from the well-known 'Beowulf' MS., namely: Cotton Vitellius, A. XV. It was first published by Cockayne in his *Narratiunculae Anglice Conscriptae*, 1861, and a collation of his text was given by Holder in *Anglia* I, 507. This text rests upon a collation made by Wülcker, and explanations and corrections will be printed elsewhere.

W. Sattler continues his Examples of the Uses of Prepositions with—VIII *an audience of*; IX *in . . . and under . . . circumstances*; X *different to*, which, with Alford, he rightly condemns; XI *in the distance*, and *at (a, some) distance*.

H. Varnhagen continues his contributions to Middle-English Poems with XI. The Proverbs of Hending, heretofore printed only from the text in Harl. MS. 2253 (L). Varnhagen supplies two other texts, Camb. Univ. MS. Gg. I, 1 (C), and Bodl. Digby MS. 86 (O); XII William of Shorham, remarks on selected verses; XIII on the Contest between the Thrush and the Nightingale, printed previously from Digby MS. 86; here a fragment from the Auchinleck MS., once printed by Laing.

G. Tanger undertakes to prove that Q₂ (1604) of Hamlet was printed from Shakspere's manuscript, if we believe this of Q₂ of Romeo and Juliet. He regards Q₁ (1603) as plagiarized, and institutes a comparison between Q₂ and the Hamlet of the First Folio (1623). His method is that adopted by Tycho Mommsen in the Prolegomena to his edition of Romeo and Juliet (1859), to show the same thing with respect to Q₂ of Romeo and Juliet. He refers to Mommsen's criticism of Delius's Hamlet (1854) in *Neue Jahrb. für Phil. u. Päd.* vol. 72 (1855), and regrets that Mommsen did not apply his method to Hamlet also. The investigation notices: 1. Orthographical peculiarities; 2. Grammatical peculiarities; 3. The striking mistakes in Q₂; 4. The orthographical treatment of syncope in Q₂ as shown in syncope of forms in -ed, unsyncopated forms in -ed, forms in -est, and forms in -es and -eth. I have not space to follow the writer into particulars; but after treating these points at considerable length, he concludes that the probability is as great that Q₂ of Hamlet was printed directly from Shakspere's MS. as that Q₂ of Romeo and Juliet was so printed according to Mommsen's assertion.

E. Hauffe furnishes a few corrections to his edition of the text of the Speeches of the Soul in the Worcester MS.

The number closes with a reprint of F. J. Furnivall's letter in the *Academy* (22 May, 1880), on Chaucer's Prioress's Nun-Chaplain. A Benedictine nun in an Abbey in the southwest of England has come to Mr. Furnivall's help, and shown that his conjecture was correct that the 'Nun-Chaplain' was a secretary and helper of the Prioress, one who carried her crosier on high festivals. She has also shown that it was common to have several priests in one Abbey on account of the several chapels in the church, at each of which mass might be said on the same day. She unravels the third puzzle by suggesting that 'by Seynt Loy' was no oath at all, and that said saint was 'an imaginary quantity' (!) notwithstanding the learned guesses at St. Louis, St. Eligius, etc. This may or may not be, for, even if 'to swear without necessity is strictly forbidden,' such a mild oath as 'by St. Eloi,' or 'St. Louis,' may not have been specially 'rude' in the Prioress's mouth, and Chaucer may here be as true to nature as usual. At all events, the existence or non-existence of the particular saint does not detract from the piety of the Prioress.

J. M. GARNETT.

MNemosyne, Vol. IX, Part II.

In this number (pp. 113-148) Cobet concludes his 'ἀπομνημονεύματα' of G. G. Pluygers. We have more than two hundred critical notes on passages in the Letters and Orations of Cicero. Naturally most of these can be of interest only in connection with the text to which they refer; but a single extract may be made. On ad Att. v. 19, 3: *de Patrone et tuis condiscipulis quae de parietinis in MILITIA laboravi, ea tibi grata esse gaudeo.* 'Pro absurdo IN MILITIA Pluygers annotavit IN MELITE esse legendum. Memmius pro Consule Athenis nescio quid aedificare in animo habebat, quod ut fieri posset demolienda erant parietinae illius domus, in qua olim Epicurus cum amicis habitaverat. Patro igitur Epicureorum princeps Roman ad Ciceronem litteras miserat, ut Memmum sibi placaret peteretque *ut nescio quid illud parietinarum sibi concederet* (ad Fam. xiii, 1, 3). Habitaverat autem Epicurus Athenis ἐν Μελίτῃ eamque domum testamento amicis suis legavit. In Epicuri testamento legitur apud Diogenem Laertium x, § 17: *τὴν δὲ οἰκιαν τὴν ἐν Μελίτῃ παρεχέτωσαν Ἀμνόμαχος καὶ Τιμοκράτης ἐνικεῖν Ἐρμάρχῳ καὶ τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ φιλοσοφοῖσιν.* In several instances the corrections proposed by Pluygers have already been introduced into the text: in others it is by no means certain that the change suggested should be made. For example: Philip. ii, § 107: *quos clientes nemo habere velit non modo illorum cliens esse: 'repositus necessarium NEDUM illorum cliens esse.'* But cf. Madv. Gr. 461, b. n. 3. In very many cases, however, the sense is so much improved by the alteration that there can be hardly any doubt of its correctness. E. g. Philip. xiii, § 25: *quam ita obsides, nove Hannibal, ut tu ipse obsideas: 'absurda haec quidem oratio est se ipsum obsidere. Pluygers emendavit: ita obsides—ut ipse obsideARIS, id est, ut Graeci loquuntur, πολιορκούμενος μᾶλλον ἢ πολιορκῶν.'* The change here I now see has been made by Kayser. Cobet concludes his paper with these words: 'haec habebam quae ex sermonibus et libris expromerem Pluygersii nostri, "ἀνδρός, ὃς ἵμεις φάμεν ἀν, ὃν πάποτε ἐπειράθημεν, ἀρίστον καὶ ἀλλως φρονιμωτάτον καὶ δικαιοτάτον."

The next article (pp. 149-166) is by van Herwerden, in which, after offering about a hundred emendations of the text of Procopius, he says, 'recensebo prae-cipios locos ubi *veterum simia*, ut recte hominem appellavit Reiskius, Thucydi-dem, Herodotum, aliosque, sed ante omnes rerum scriptorem Atticum imitatus esse videatur.' The first instance he quotes is from the opening of the book *de bello Persico*, and contains the following words: Προκόπιος Καισαριεὺς τοὺς πολέμους ξυνέγραφεν—ὅς πη αὐτῶν ἐκάστους ξυνενέχθη γενέσθαι, ὃς μὴ ἔργα ἵπερμεγέθη ὁ μέγας αἰών—ἔξιτηλα θῆται, ὥνπερ τὴν μνῆμην αὐτὸς φέτο μέγα τι ἐσεσθαι καὶ ξυνοίσον ἐς τὰ μάλιστα τοῖς τε νῦν οὖσι καὶ τοῖς ἐς τὰ ἐπειτα γεννησούμενοις, εἰ ποτε καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ χρόνος ἐς ὄμοιαν τιὰ τὸν ἀγθρώπους ἀνάγκην διωθοῖτο. This portion of the article is very interesting. It is curious to see how many sentences are a perfect *cento* of reminiscences of Herodotus and Thucydides, often combined without any regard to propriety. E. g. p. 198, 10: 'ἱποτελέεις—ἐς φόρον ἀπαγωγήν: illud ex Thucydide sumsit, hoc ex Herodoto, utrumque ita jungens ut nascatur inepta abundantia. Thucydides aut nude ἱποτελῆς dicere solet aut φόρον ἱποτελῆς.' After quoting many other examples, and particularly a long extract of a speech placed in the mouth of the Gothic general, he concludes, 'ita denique anxie homo erat Thucydides, ut quodvis potius

piaculum committeret quam scribebat duplex t, aut *σίν*, aut *εἰς*' Herwerden says that he was led to the study of Procopius in the hope rather than the expectation that these frequent quotations or imitations might afford some hints for the emendation of Thucydides. But 'licet paucas quasdam suspicções meas confirmare videantur, nihil novi ex illis didici. Neque mirum. Nam et multis ante Procopium seculis huius scriptoris codices iam misere corruptos fuisse constat ex Dionysio Halicarnassensi, tum Procopius locos quosdam nobiles *non ita multos* cum certis quibusdam formulis, vocabulis, structuris Thucydideis memoria tenebat, quibus identidem usus est, ne intellecto quidem sic eo magis in oculos incurrere ipsius soloecismos, ubi suo utatur sermone.'

In the next article (pp. 167-191) Cobet continues his criticism *περὶ κατεψευσμένης ἱστορίας*. He now examines the narrative given by Livy of the events preceding the battle of Pydna, particularly in reference to the arrogant mission which the Rhodians sent to Rome, to demand that the war with Perseus should be brought to an end: 'per quos stetisset quo minus belli finis fieret, adversus eos quid sibi faciendum esset, Rhodios consideraturos esse.' Cobet takes great pains to show that Livy has placed this event a year too soon: that the narrative of Polybius is throughout more sober and self-consistent, and that it would have been better if Livy had not attempted to set it off in more imposing colors by inserting inventions of his own or trusting to inferior authorities. 'In plerisque nil nisi Polybii narrationem Latine vertit et operae pretium est videre quam eleganter et venuste sordidum et plebeium Polybii sermonem Romano vestitu induat, sed male factum quod rerum incuriosior et ad facundas orationes tamquam gemmas operi inserendas intentior multa negligenter, multa confuse omissis quae necessaria sint et temporum ratione perturbata scribit.' But Cobet's assertion *NIHIL QUIDQUAM IN HIS VERO EST* is by no means made out by his examination. He discusses at great length the events of the third Macedonian war, and especially the career of the consul of B. C. 169, Q. Marcius Philippus, and decides that he, finding himself entirely incapable of dealing with Perseus, had *δύναμιν* induced the Rhodians to endeavor to put an end to the war by their ill-advised embassy. This is substantially the account given by Mommsen (ii, p. 363, Eng. Tr.) who says: 'The key [to the interference of the Rhodians] is furnished by the well-attested account that the consul Quintus Marcius, that master of the "new-fashioned diplomacy," had in the camp at Heracleum (and therefore after the occupation of the pass of Tempe) loaded the Rhodian envoy Agepolis with civilities and made an underhand request to him to mediate a peace.'

The next article (pp. 192-200) is the first part of a letter from J. B. Kan to Cobet, making some animadversions on the emendations suggested by Pluygers, which appeared in the preceding number of the magazine. Mr. Kan says he well remembers how he presented himself thirty-three years ago at Zwolle to be examined in Greek by Cobet, who had just been appointed professor at Leyden. On the top of the diligence he had got by heart 'paucos illos ex Iliad. l. vi versus, quibus poëta et Andromachen et maritum—et se ipse caelo beavit'; for he had heard at Groningen that it was Cobet's rule 'a miseris adolescentulis exigere, ut ex illis carminibus colon, quantulumcunque erat,

memoriter recitarent. Me, puerum nondum sedecim annos natum, Odeum Zwollanum ingressum tuorum oculorum aciem vix ferre potuisse libens fateor. At cum mihi assidens de lingua Graeca quaestiones instituere coepisses, paullatim animi angores levabantur: videbaris enim magis tecum confabular, quam severum iudicem agere.' He says he has not found himself able to approve all the emendations of Cornelius Nepos proposed by Pluygers, and he ventures to express his dissent in a letter to Cobet: 'num operae pretium fecerim cum animadversiones meas descriptas ad te mittere decrevi ego nescio, atque quod de puer, de viro quoque penes te indicium esto.' The following are examples of his notes: In Cimon. iii, 1, *incidit in eandem invidiam quam pater suus*, Pluygers inserted *in* before *quam*. But 'solent Romani in tali oratione mutila et quasi decurtata, ubi ex iis quae praecedunt verbum cogitatione supplendum est, ante relativum praepositionem omittere.' This he confirms by quoting Cic. ad Att. iii. 19, 2; ad Q. fr. i, 4, 4. In Alcib. ii fin. *nisi maiora potiora haberemus*, 'Pluygersii *potiora* deleri iubentis sententiam tua auctoritate tutatus es, cum bis idem dici idque ἀσυνδέτως tibi putidum videretur. Neque tamen de asyndeto aut de synynomio quodam sermo esse potest. Est enim *potiora* praedicati, quod dicunt, loco habendum. Quod si verum est, res eo reddit ut scriptor noster, quamquam multa se de Alcibiadis amoribus referre posse affirmat, neget se hoc facturum quod res maiores, quas vel belli vel domi gessit, narrare mavult.'

The next article (pp. 201-209) contains remarks on Antiphon by van Herwerden. In i, 12 he agrees with Cobet in reading $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma\ \mu\bar{\eta}\ \kappa\alpha\tau\varphi\iota\varphi\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon$ 'quia in precando et invitando sollemnis est post $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma$ ($\delta\pi\omega\varsigma\ \mu\bar{\eta}$) futuri temporis usus.' But he cannot follow Cobet, although he has been maintaining it for thirty years, in deciding that $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma$ and $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma\ \mu\bar{\eta}$ are necessarily followed by the second aorist subjunctive or the future indicative, no matter what they depend upon. The fact that $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma\ \dot{\epsilon}\rho\bar{\eta}\varsigma$, $\lambda\bar{\eta}\sigma\eta\varsigma$, $\lambda\bar{\eta}\varphi\eta\tau\varsigma$, etc., occur constantly in the best MSS. only proves that 'labente Graecitate sensim in desuetudinem abiisse veterem illam structuram cum Futuro, eiusque ignorantia librarios persaepe peccasse, sed minime inde sequitur, omnibus *millenis* illis locis, ubi hodie libri post eas coniunctiones Aor. i coniunctivum habeant, idem accidisse. Scire autem per velim quid Graecos movere potuerit ut post $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma$ ($\delta\pi\omega\varsigma\ \mu\bar{\eta}$) admittentes coniunctivum Aor. i passivi et Aoristi ii activi, medii, passivi, tam anxiavitarent coniunctivum Aoristi i activi et medii, qui tamen aoristus forma tantum, non significatione, ab altero distinguitur. Speciem saltem aliquam res haberet, si futuri usus excluderetur in iis verbis quae habent aoristum ii, sed non negabit Cobetus optime dici $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma$ ($\mu\bar{\eta}$) $\lambda\bar{\eta}\sigma\eta\varsigma$, $\dot{\alpha}\bar{\pi}\phi\dot{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma\eta\tau\varsigma$, $\lambda\bar{\eta}\varphi\eta\tau\varsigma$, $\kappa\alpha\tau\varphi\iota\varphi\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon$, similia multa. Et quomodo explicandum veterum grammaticorum, quod sciām, neminem exortum esse, qui tam foedo, ut Cobeto videtur, soloecismo abstinentem esse moneret, ut sedulo hortantur ne quis dicat $\mu\bar{\eta}\ \lambda\bar{\eta}\gamma\eta\varsigma$ aut $\mu\bar{\eta}\ \epsilon\iota\pi\bar{\epsilon}$, aliaque eiusmodi?' In regard to Cobet's remark (quoted in Vol. II, p. 243, of this journal) that the Inscriptions furnish only one example of $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma$ with the first aor. subjunctive, which Cobet emends by inserting $\dot{\alpha}\bar{\nu}$, Herwerden says 'at non reputavit primo etiam futuri exempla in titulis esse perrara, deinde licet erroribus non vacent, inscriptiones tamen antiquas, si cum optimis codicibus comparentur, plane egregios et fidelissimos esse veteris memoriae etiam in rebus grammaticis testes.' And he then quotes another inscription which exhibits $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma$ —*κομίσων-*

rat. His belief is: 'traditioni tamdiu esse criticis obtemperandum, quamdiu non firmis argumentis falsam eam esse constiterit. Nec hercle φιλονικίᾳ quadam sed solo veri amore ductus sententiam viri tanto me sagacioris et eruditioris tamque egregie de litteris Graecis meriti ac merentis impugno. Nam quo maior est alicuius in aliqua disciplina auctoritas, eo diligentius cavendum est ne magni sui nominis splendore alios in errorem perducat imprudentes.' Herwerden then proceeds to some criticisms on the Tetralogies, which Cobet had neglected as being *pravi et vitiosi acuminis plenas*: he thinks this judgment is more correct than that of Blass who admires them highly. His own opinion is that they are not by Antiphon: 'non desunt, ut arbitror, indicia in sermone, quo eorum auctor utitur, unde appareat eas non seculo quinto a. Christum a germano scriptore Attico sed satis recenti aetate ab homine (Ionico?) sermonis Attici non peritissimo esse composita'. He quotes as illustrations of his meaning ἐπεξερχόμενοι for ἐπεξιόντες, καταδοκεῖν for ἵποπτεῖν, ἀναγγιγνωσκεῖν for ἀναπειθόμενοι, πειρασθέντες for ἐλέγχοντες for ἐλέγχειν, εἰκότερον, καταλαμβάνειν for καταψηφίζεσθαι, ἀπελογήθη for ἀπελογήσατο. The latest editor, Iernstedt, it is true, rejects as 'puerilia' the arguments by which Schoemann's opinion is supported that only the *de crede Herodis* and the *de Chorenata* are really by Antiphon; but Herwerden cannot agree with Iernstedt that the rest must be assigned to Antiphon, because we do not know who else can have been their author.

The last article (pp. 212-224) is by Naber, entitled Sophoclea. He repeats his remarks on Aeschylus, saying that in the emendation of Sophocles also, while he recognizes the fact that much remains to be done, he shall venture only on 'minutias quasdam.' In Ajax, 319 he proposes βραχυψήχον for βαρυψήχον: 488 he reads ἐν πόδει (for πλούτῳ) Φρυγῶν. In Antig. 117 πτάς (for στάς) δ' ἐπέρ μελάθρων: 258, ἐλκοντος for ἐλθόντος: 580 φρίσσοντι for φείγοντι. 'Risit alicubi Cobetus neque immerito studiosorum juvenum ineptias, qui quum semel iterumque Sophoclem perlegissent, sine mora sese accingerent ad corrigenda et sollicitanda ea, quae vixdum satis potuissent cognoscere. Non ignoro in quos hoc dictum sit, et memini tempus, quum Leidae quotquot ibi studiorum causa commorabamur, omnes correpti essemus novo quodam furoris genere et certatim deferremur ad Sophoclem emendandum. Nihil attinet proloqui quo eventu equidem tunc praeclara τῆς Ἀττικῆς μελίτης monumenta vexaverim, quum etiam hodie post annos plus quam triginta tanta mihi deesse intelligam; sed fuit tamen inter nos alter altero interdum felicior et non est mirandum nobis accidisse quod etiam caecis gallinis in fabula.' He refers especially to a proposed discussion of Antig. 1219:

τάδ' ἐξ ἀθύμον δεσπότον κελευσμάσιν
ήθροῦμεν,

in which Neue proposed ἐδρῶμεν, and Burton κελευσμάτων, which Nauck has received.

The unoccupied parts of pages in this number are filled up by Cobet with emendations of passages in Theopompus, Plutarch, Aristides, and Polybius.

C. D. MORRIS.

GERMANIA. Vierteljahrsschrift für deutsche Alterthumskunde. Herausgegeben von KARL BARTSCH. Wien, 1881. Heft 1, 2.

The first number opens with a severe criticism by the editor, Dr. Bartsch, of the text of the Treves Aegidius and Silvester, as published last year by Rödiger and Steinmeyer in the *Ztschft. f. deut. Alt.* 21, 22. A comparison with the original fragments causes the Doctor to exclaim, "das jener erste Druck so jämmerlich war, wie er sich nun herausstellte, konnte ich nicht ahnen." A new text with annotations of the Aegidius and corrections of the Silvester are furnished by B. The third paper, also by the editor, deals with the Treves fragments of a Low-German Floyris communicated by Steinmeyer in the *Ztschft. f. deut. Alt.* 21. Upon collation they show a more correct reading than the Aegidius and Silvester.

Ludwig Laistner follows with a lengthy article, continued in the second number, on the words Nobishaus and Nobiskrug. The paper affords a large amount of curious material for study, and discusses words like Nobiskratte, Rosengarten, Galilaea, and others that connected themselves in popular fancy with an abode beyond the grave.

Bartsch supplies some fragments by an Alemannic poet of the 13th century, which were sent to him by F. Apfelstedt. They were originally copied from a MS. in the National Library of Paris.

Anton Birlinger publishes a fragment of Hartmann's *Iwein* from a MS. of the 14th century in his possession. Some references to Lachmann's reading are added.

Two popular hymns which the Strassburg University purchased some time ago from K. Trübner are treated by Bartsch in the next paper. They are both found in Wackernagel, *Kirchenlied II*, 946, 931, and the text of the first is almost identical with W.'s version. The second, which differs much from it and seems to be older, is printed at length.

R. Sprenger has a correction in the spelling and therefore translation of the word *kaeskar* (cf. Mhd. Wb. 1, 788) in a passage from Rüdiger v. Hunkhofen's story of the Schlegel (Hagen's G. A. II, 49)

315. "Disc zwêne süne sint gar
Geduh in ein kaeskar."

The spelling should be *keskar* as it occurs in the Col. Cod. 165 (cf. Kes Mhd. Wb. 1, 802), and *kar* should be rendered by cavity in the mountains, hence *keskar*, a cavity in the mountains filled with ice and snow. Sprenger continues in the next paper with more references and citations for A. Jeitteles *Altdeutsche Predigten aus dem Benedictinerstifte St. Paul in Kärnten, Innsbruck, 1878.*

Emil Weller closes the list of articles of the first number with the names of early German newspapers not mentioned in the publication of the literary society in Tübingen *Die ersten deutschen Zeitungen, Tübingen, 1872.*

The book-notices contain favorable criticisms by Felix Liebrecht of A. Bondeson's *Halländska Sagor*, Lund, 1880, and Eugène Rolland's *Faune popu-*

laire de la France, Paris, 1877, 79. The miscellany has a letter of Jacob Grimm to Dr. J. L. Klee, corrections by C. Marold of his review of E. Bernhardt's *Vulfilia*, and some minor communications by the editor. Among the personals we notice the death of the Germanist Dr. Karl Roth, well-known as the editor of *Deutsche Predigten des XII u. XIII Jhs.*

C. Marold's article, the first in the second number, *Kritische Untersuchungen über den Einfluss des Latein. auf die gothische Bibelübersetzung*, treats a subject that has received in recent years a fair share of attention. Not so very long ago, at least before Bernhardt's work appeared (1875), comparatively few were of opinion that *Ulfilas* had consulted a Latin version of the Bible. Gabelentz and Loebe opposed the idea that he had, and Bernhardt himself in his *Kritische Untersuchungen*, 1864, 68, agreed with them, till upon a renewed study of the Gothic text in his last work he admits "schon *Ulfilas* habe eine alte lateinische Übersetzung benutzt." At the instance of Prof. O. Schade, the Königsberg faculty made the influence of a Latin version on the Gothic Bible the subject of an essay which was undertaken by Marold, and of which the results were published in 1875 in the *Wissenschaftliche Blätter* of Königsberg. The objects which Marold now proposes to himself are stated thus: To show systematically the points of agreement of the Gothic Bible with Latin versions; to find out whether a certain consistency is observed in these points, which would go far to settle the idea of later interpolations (cf. Gabelentz u. Loebe), and furthermore to recognize those texts to which the Gothic text approaches when it leaves the Greek version. This valuable paper is not finished so far.

Edzardi has a paper on the Pommersfeld MS. P of the large Rosengarten printed by Bartsch in the *Germ.* 4, 1-33. He thinks that certain traits in this MS. bring it nearer to the original than perhaps all the other MSS. that have been preserved of the epic, and in proof of this, cites among other matter the remark of King Gibich (verse 3-6)—only found in this MS. at the beginning (cf. MS. D, verse 30)—that he would serve the victor of the Rosengarten, but the conquered must serve him. At the close of the poem the vanquished king accordingly,

852. ". . . nam abe sîn crônen mit sîner werden hant
ûf gab kong Gibich schône beide borge unde lant,"

but upon the advice of Dieterich receives them back from King Etzel, which is another trait not found in the rest of MSS. This battling for land and glory, Edzardi continues, is certainly more in keeping with the spirit of our old heathen heroes than to fight "um Rosen und einer Frau Kuss," and he is still further confirmed in his opinion that the Krimhild phase was added later, by certain contradictory passages in the *Nibelungenlied*. Sigfrid comes to Worms on the very peaceable errand of wooing Krimhild. It is certainly a remarkable introduction to her family, considering the object of his visit, when he tells the brother and king,

- (N. Bartsch 110, 2.) "Ich wil an iu ertwingen swaz ir muget hân,
lant unde bûrge, daz sol mir werden undertân,"
- and in strophe 113, 2, ". . . ouch diu erbe mîn,
erwirbest du'z mit sterke, diu sulen dir undertae nec sîn.

So he seems to have forgotten for awhile why he came to Worms. These inconsistencies show a blending of different sagas, of which the older, confirmed by the Norse saga, makes Sigfrid leave his home to meet the Burgundian kings in combat to gain land and glory, while a younger myth sends him to Worms to woo Krimhild. The older conception is expressed in the beginning of the Rosengarten MS. P. It should, however, be remembered that with the exception of this feature, Krimhild is the challenging party even in this MS.

90, 2. "Swer dort geseget . . .

in kusse di meit Krimhilt und gitm ein rösen crenzelin."

M. Gaster in an article *Zur Quellenkunde deutscher Sagen und Märchen*, communicates a number of parallels, chiefly from Hebrew sources, of fables and customs treated before by Grimm, Simrock and others, among them the barnacle story mentioned by M. Müller in his second series of lectures on language.

F. Apfelstedt follows with a detailed description of the Parisian MS. (Manessische), and C. M. Blass sends *Volksthümliches aus Niederösterreich*.

The book-notices of the second number include Edzardi's notice of Oskar Klockhoff's *Studier öfver Thiðrekssaga af Bern*, Upsala, 1880. E. hails this pamphlet as a valuable contribution to text criticism, and thinks that through it the MS. question has entered upon a new stage. Bartsch reviews G. Bötticher's work *Die Wolfram Literatur seit Lachmann mit kritischen Anmerkungen*, Berlin, 1880, and questions the writer's ability to write *Kritische Anmerkungen*. Bartsch ironically adds, "In der Tat, Hr. B. ist nach den in dieser Schrift gelieferten Proben würdig, in Gemeinschaft mit dem Dr. E. Henrici den Jahresbericht der Berliner Gesellschaft für deutsche Philologie zu redigiren."

The report by C. Marold, d. deutsch-romanischen Section auf der 35. Versammlung deut. Philologen und Schulmänner in Stettin, Septbr. 1880, shows the election of K. Bartsch as first and O. Behaghel as second president.

Among the personals we find Prof. Sievers' non-acceptance of the call to a chair at Harvard.

The second number closes with a reply of A. Jeitteles to Anton Schönbach's severe notice of J.'s *Altdeutsche Predigten aus dem Benedictinerstifte St. Paul*.

C. F. RADDATZ.

ARCHIV FÜR LITTERATURGESCHICHTE. Herausgegeben von Dr. FRANZ SCHNORR v. CAROLSFELD. Leipzig, 1880. Heft 1, 2.

This is one of the best, if not the best, of publications devoted to German literature. Its criticisms are nearly always well-founded and appreciative.

Heft 1.

Pp. 1-5. *Eulenspiegel* by Karl Goedeke. G. after a brief discussion concludes that the original of the High-German *Eulenspiegel* may be found in a rhymed Low-German production of 1483.

Pp. 6-12. Über den Verfasser der Tragedia Johannis Huss. The author of this anonymous drama, Wittenberg, 1537, was generally thought to have been Johann Agricola of Eisleben. Lately this has been doubted by Goedeke, who

points to Johann Ackermann of Zwickau as the writer (cf. *Göttinger gelehrten Anzeiger* 1880, 21, 660). Gustav Kawerau upon a close scrutiny of facts maintains that after all Agricola of Eisleben must have been the author. (cf. *Miscellany Archiv* X, 2, 1.)

Pp. 13-34. *Über den Hans Sachs zugeschriebenen Lobspruch auf die Stadt Rostock* by H. Giske. The national museum of Nürnberg is in possession of an old original wood-cut representing a view of Rostock, and under it is a poem in honor of the city which closes,

"Das jr (Rostock) gelück grün, plü vnd wachs
das wünscht jr zu Nürnberg Hans S."

Giske denies the authorship of Hans Sachs, and the arguments in proof of his opinion seem certainly conclusive.

Pp. 34-38. *Lessings Jugenddichtungen in ihrer Beziehung zu Molière* by Richard Mahrenholz shows some instances of Molière's influence upon the earliest dramatic efforts of Lessing.

Pp. 39-73. *Aus Wilhelm Heinse's Nachlass* by Herm. Hettner contributes a number of posthumous letters of Heinse, Klinger and Maler Müller.

Pp. 74-82. *Zum Leipziger Liederbuche Goethes* by Richard M. Werner. Prompted by Scherer's publication "Aus Goethes Frühzeit" (Quellen und Forschungen XXXIV), Werner proposes to supply more material for Goethe study by subjecting the literary sources of Goethe's Lieder in melodien gesetzt von B. T. Breitkopf, Leipzig 1770, to a closer examination. Das Schreyen, nach dem Italienischen is treated in this paper.

Pp. 83-100. *Goethe und Sophie La Roche* by W. Fielitz, and *Zu Schillers Räubern* by Jacob Minor, furnish emendations of G. v. Loeper's edition of Goethe's letters to Sophie La Roche and a reference to probable sources of Spiegelberg's story in the *Robbers*, Act II, Scene 3.

Pp. 101-122. *Ein Brief Schillers an Huber* by H. Dünzter, P. Kohlmann on *Seume* in Emden, and *Africanische Märchen* by Felix Liebrecht close the list of papers of the first number.

Pp. 123-138. *Andresens deutsche Volksetymologie* 3d edition, reviewed by G. Büchmann, *Zur Lessing Litteratur*, and book-notices by Robert Boxberger.

Pp. 139-144. *Miscellaneous*. A new *Faust-Buch* in the city library of Zwickau reported by L. Wespy. An opinion of Herder's *Ideen* by L. Geiger. A suppressed strophe in Schiller's *Künstlern* by Boxberger. The time when certain of Schiller's poems were written, by F. Jonas.

Heft 2.

Pp. 145-173. *Dramen und Dramatiker des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts* by Hugo Holstein. R. Pilger's article in the *Ztschft. f. d. Philologie*, XI, 129, entitled "Die Dramatisierung der Susanna im 16ten Jahrhundert" compares the Magdeburg text of the Susanna drama with the Nürnberg version, and is impressed with the greater correctness of the former in punctuation, spelling, etc. Upon a new collation of the two texts, H. Holstein nevertheless finds the Magdeburg text in various places utterly incorrect, whole lines having been dropped through the negligence of the printer. H. suggests the following

changes in Goedeke, *Grundriss* 1. On p. 306 the numbers 117 and 118 should be united and not read as if intended for separate editions. There is no edition of 1534, but one of 1535. "Zwickau" should be removed after 123 and 124 and placed with 125. This last text is identical with 117 (118). The list of Susanna texts given by Goedeke 1, on p. 306 should be augmented (cf. Pilger in *Ztschft. f. d. philologie*). The oldest Esther play after Hans Sachs' "Comedi von der Hester," 1536, is the Magdeburg of 1537. Holstein is inclined to look upon Valentin Voigt, a master-singer of whom we do not know much, as the author (cf. Goedeke 1, 308, 141). The popularity of the Biblical Esther and Susanna for the drama of the 16th and 17th centuries was certainly great, thus Esther is the subject of one Latin drama (Naogeorgius), three German translations and eight different German versions. H. Holstein gives a short description of the Magdeburg Esther, and closes with comments and short synopses of a religious poem and plays by Joachim Greff (cf. Scherer, *Deutsche Studien* III, Wien 1878) and Johann Bussleben (cf. Goedeke 1, 311, 172).

Pp. 174-192. Briefe von Peter Watzdorff of Jena (1546), copied from the royal archives of Dresden by the editor Dr. Schnorr v. Carolsfeld, and an unpublished letter of Schubart to Sec. Griessbach of Karlsruhe, communicated by E. Schmidt.

Pp. 192-208. Das Heidenröslein eine Goethesche Dichtung oder ein Volkslied? by Hermann Dunger. In the fifth volume of the *Archiv*, p. 84, this question was treated by the Herder editor B. Suphan, who came to the conclusion that the Heidenröslein must be considered a volkslied, and that Herder probably heard it at his home in East Prussia before he knew Goethe. Dunger dissents from this opinion and repels the idea of plagiarism. D. is evidently well acquainted with volkslieder, and arranges his knowledge so as to carry his points home to the reader. The paper is most readable.

Pp. 209-219. Zu Julius von Tarent by Otto Brahm, and an unpublished letter of Schiller to his wife, by W. Arndt. Brahm discovers some remarkable resemblances in J. A. Leisewitz's drama *Julius von Tarent* (1776) and Lessing's *Emilia Galotti* (1772). It seems strange that Lessing did not see it.

Pp. 220-262. H. Ulrich zu Schiller's Balladen contributes matter connected with the sources of the Pescecola story in Schiller's *Diver* and the ballad *Kampf mit dem Drachen*, not noticed by former commentators, and Rudolf Genée publishes *Studien zu Schlegels Shakespeare Übersetzung*. Through the kindness of the authorities of the Dresden library, Genée was enabled to institute anew a critical examination of the original Schlegel MSS. These studies will be welcomed as a supplement to M. Bernays' work *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Schlegelschen Shakespeare*, 1872.

Pp. 263-272. Book-notices. Robert Boxberger reviews F. Muncker's essay, *Lessings persönliches und literarisches Verhältniss zu Klopstock*, Frankfurt a. M., 1880, and the *Goethe-Jahrbuch*, vol. 1, published by L. Geiger. W. v. Biedermann notices *Studien zur Goethe-Philologie* by J. Minor and A. Sauer, Wien 1880, and *Jugendbriefe Goethes* by W. Fielitz, Berlin 1880. R. M. Werner reviews Albert Bielschowsky's study *Friederike Brion*, Breslau 1880. All the criticisms are rather favorable.

Pp. 273-284. Miscellany. Correction by Goedeke regarding Kawerau's paper, Archiv X, 1, two brief notices from Hugo Holstein Zu Erasmus Alberus and Heinrich Chnustinus, ten communications from Anton Birlinger, Der getreue Eckhard, Ibrahims Ausspruch über die deutsche Einigkeit, Tiersage und Beichtstuhl, Volksbücher in Reformationsstreitschriften, Name Schiller in Sulz, Alte Bitte um Nachsicht wegen Druckfehler, Semiramis, Zum Volksliede, Zu Lessings Nathan. R. Bechstein mentions the oldest edition of A. Musculus' Hosenteufel, and Wilhelm Zipperer closes the second number with a history of C. F. D. Schubart's Kaplidi.

C. F. RADDATZ.

ARCHIV FÜR MITTEL- UND NEUGRIECHISCHE PHILOLOGIE, herausgegeben von DR. MICHAEL DEFFNER. Athen, A. Coromilas, 1880. Bd. I, Heft I-II. 8vo. 304 pp.¹

This new, handsomely printed periodical, which is to deal with matters of mediaeval and modern Greek philology, sets out with the following programme of contents :

- (a) LONGER ARTICLES on the history of mediaeval and modern Greek, on Grammar, Dialectology, Literature, Political History and auxiliary sciences, Geography, Law, Mythology, Customs, Usages and Beliefs, Useful and Fine Arts, etc.
- (b) SHORTER ARTICLES on similar subjects.
- (c) Mediaeval and Modern Greek TEXTS, Accounts of MSS.
- (d) Mediaeval and Modern Greek LEXICOLOGY, Etymology.
- (e) REVIEWS, notices, bibliographical contributions.
- (f) Maps, plans, illustrations of costumes, toilette articles, coats-of arms, coins, etc.
- (g) ALBANIAN Studies.

Such a programme no one man could better fill than Dr. Deffner, who was a favorite disciple of Dr. G. Curtius, and has now for many years lived in Athens and other parts of Greece, occupying himself with the subjects which he purposed to treat in this *Archiv*. His knowledge of modern Greek dialects is perhaps greater than that of any man living. He lectures on Dialectology in the National University in Athens.

The articles contained in the volume of two numbers before us are various, and for the most part valuable. More than half of them are by Dr. Deffner himself. Of these the most important are the two which deal with the language of the Tzákones, of which he has written a grammar (not yet published). One need not be prepared to follow Dr. Deffner in believing that the Tzakones are descendants of the Lakones, and their name but a corruption of that of this ancient race, in order to admit the value of his researches. Like most specialists, he claims perhaps a little too much for his subject ; but that is natural and therefore excusable. In submitting Tzakonian to scientific analysis, while it is still a living form of speech, he has done great service to Greek philology. Whoever, ethnically considered, the Tzakones may be, their language certainly contains many purely Doric elements and many interesting phenomena. Dr.

¹ See American Journal of Philology, vol. II, No. 5, p. 139.

Deffner's article on the history of the Greek cases, from the days of Xenophon to those of the Klephths, is concise, clear, instructive and based on facts, and no foreigner can help lamenting that the Greeks should ever have tried to repudiate that history, by reintroducing into their literary and polite speech dead case-forms, which ill comport with their other analytic forms. His article on the poisoned honey of Ofis is most interesting, as bearing upon the curious story told by Xenophon in his *Anabasis* IV, 8, 19-21. The specimens from his Glossary of the Ofitic dialect (the Ofites are a tribe of Muhammedan Greeks living to the eastward of Trebizond) and from his "Etymological-statistical Dictionary of the Greek Dialects," contain much that is interesting, although some of the etymologies are bold and lack historical proof. All etymologists of the Curtian school ought continually to be reminded that etymologies, possible according to phonetic rules, are not necessarily true, and that until they can be traced *historically* they are, for the most part, mere hypotheses. Curtius' *Grundzüge der griechischen Etymologie* is a lasting monument of the worthlessness of mere phonetic etymologies. Dr. Deffner, who might very well stand on his own feet, is far too much influenced by the *prestige* and methods of his old teacher. But Dr. Deffner shows to least advantage in his polemics, of which there are two in the present volume. It is undoubtedly provoking to a real scholar,—and Dr. Deffner is the best foreign Modern Greek scholar living—to see sciolism misleading science; but he goes too far when he treats his opponents as guilty of bad faith and intentional misrepresentation.

The present volume contains some curious and valuable texts published now for the first time, tales, songs, etc., and a translation into Romaic (not Neo-Hellenic) of the Ugolino episode from Dante's *Inferno* by G. E. Antoniades. This last, preceded by some very sensible remarks on the present unfortunate state into which the Greeks have brought their language, is excellent, in spite of its horrible ballad metre. Dr. Schmidt's statistical article on the Earthquakes and Volcanic Eruptions in the East contains a list of all that are recorded of these unpleasant occurrences from B. C. 1000 to A. D. 1879. The recent calamities at Chios and Casamicciola will now enable the author to add to it.

Several short articles we have left unmentioned; but we must call attention to the Modern Greek Bibliography of eight pages at the end of the volume, as of great value for students of the subject. Hoping that, in spite of the slight interest hitherto shown by foreign scholars in Modern Greek studies (Dr. Deffner's complaints on this score are completely justified) the new *Archiv* may prosper and in every way reward its editor, we will close this notice by quoting a short popular song which Dr. Deffner has immensely improved by an emendation, of whose correctness there can be no doubt, viz. by changing the verbs in the fourth line from the 2d pers. sing. imperat. to 1st pers. sing. indic.

Κλαίγε με, μάννα, κλαίγε με αἰγή καὶ μεσημέρι,
Καὶ μέσ' στ' ἀνάγυρμα τοῦ ἥλιου ποτέ σου μὴ μὲ κλάψης,
Γιατὶ δειπνάει ὁ Χάροντας μὲ τὴ Χαρόντισσά του.
Κρατῶ κερὶ καὶ φέγγω τους, ποτήρι καὶ κερνῶ τους.
Μοῦ ξαμολνέται τὸ κερὶ κυ ὁ Χάροντας μὲ δέρνει (p. 224).

Could anything be sadder?

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

REVUE DE PHILOLOGIE, Vol. IV, Nos. 3 and 4.¹

(3.) 1. Pp. 145-150. Henri Weil discusses once more the fragment (in his *Papyrus inédit*) which has been assigned to the Europa of Aeschylus. He attempts this time to show that the two fragments composed in Aeschylean metre are to be united. His arguments are very ingenious, more so than a verse—κέαρ τόδ', ἐπικουρὸν μαλόντ' ἐς Ἰλιον—which he composes to fill up a supposed lacuna between vv. 15 and 16.

2. P. 150. H. W. makes three emendations in Antiphon's Murder of Herodes. (a) In § 29 he happily changes ἐπλέομεν into ἐπίνομεν. (b) In § 5 he omits ῥῆμα and ἔργον from τὸ μὲν γὰρ ῥῆμα . . . τὸ δὲ ἔργον κτέ.,—a necessary change. (c) In § 49 he inserts καὶ between οὐδέπω and νῦν.

3. Pp. 151-6. Herwerden emends Aesch. Agam. 256, removes 351-4 to another place, emends frag. 98 (Dindorf). In Sophocles he emends Philoct. 119, 412, discusses 667 ff., emends 698, 731, 831, 835, 867, 894, 921, 1048, 1061, discusses 1082, and emends 1135 and 1083. Some of the suggestions he makes are worthy of attention, but one "emendation" proceeds from ignorance of an elementary principle of Greek syntax. He says: " Philoct. 867:

ὦ φέγγος ὑπνον διάδοχον, τό τ' ελπίδων
ἀπιστον οἰκούρημα τῶνδε τῶν ξένων.

Nec Graecae neque ullius linguae proprium est articulum addere vocativo," and proposes σί for τό as the best means of emending. This use of the article with nominative forms in apostrophe or address is too familiar for discussion. I merely cite a few illustrations:

Soph. Aj. 856: σὲ δ' ὦ φαενῆς ἡμέρας τὸ νῦν σέλας κτέ.

Ib. 859-61: ὦ φέγγος . . . καὶ τὸ σύντροφον γένος.

Aristoph. Equit. 1329: ὦ ταὶ λιπαραὶ . . . Ἀθῆναι (after Pindar).

Examples might be cited by the score.

4. Pp. 157-60. O. Riemann continues his *Collatio codicum Livianorum*.

5. Pp. 161-71. Jules Nicols discusses again the choice by lot of Athenian archons. After enumerating all the instances of ancient testimony on the subject, he rejects, as being unreliable, all but two: (1) Herodot. VI 109, where it is stated that the polemarch was chosen by lot, and (2) the chronological list of the ἀρχοντες ἐπώνυμοι, from which it appears that between 493 and 479 B. C. this office was filled by Themistocles, Aristides, and Xanthippus—the very men whom the people would have chosen. Having discussed the views of others, he shows from ancient testimony that the names only of those who announced themselves as candidates were put into the urn; and then suggests the theory that circumstances sometimes rendered it evident that certain persons were pre-eminently entitled to the office, and that consequently no other persons would dare to announce themselves. He further expresses the opinion that, at least at the time of the Persian wars, lots were drawn for each archon separately, and hence the choice of Callimachus as polemarch, a man who had already as a general gained distinction for bravery and ability. This carries the choice by lot back to 490. How much earlier it began cannot be determined with certainty, but it was probably during, or immediately after, the times of Clisthenes.

¹ See American Journal of Philology, Vol. I, p. 372.

Pp. 171-6. Notices of books on classical subjects.

7. *Revue des Revues*, pp. 65-208.

(4.) 1. Pp. 177-85. Léon Fontaine discusses two MSS. (in the University library of Montpellier) of the Moral Distichs of Cato—one belonging to the ninth century, and the other, which is very incomplete, to the eleventh. He gives a list of variants, some of which are important, and closes with a discussion of some questions in regard to these MSS.

2. P. 185. O. Riemann calls attention to *-que* after short *e* in Livy (XXI 39, 2), but shows that the reading is false. For "inluviz tabeque" we should read "inluvie et tabe quae," and insert *with the MSS.* "erat" after "otium" in the preceding portion of the sentence, and make "movebat" plural.

3. Pp. 186-7. Grammatical Notes (continued), by O. Riemann. (a) Πόλη for πόλει occurs some eight times in the C. I. A., and γραμματή for -ει occurs once. R. regards γ in both instances as a remnant of the old Ionic form ɳ, contracted. (b) *Quam* (without *ut* or *qui*) followed by the subjunctive after a comparative: Varro, De re rust., I 51, 1; Cic., in Verr. II, IV 34, 76; Nepos, Paus. III 2. In these passages he regards the subjunctive as conditional, and holds that the indicative would mean about the same thing.

4. P. 188. Ch. G. shows conclusively that in Appian's Civil Wars, II 82, s. fin., λαμπρῶς belongs to νικήσομεν and not to ἀνεβόησε, although the latter combination would be good Greek.

5. P. 188. L. Havet restores the reading of the old editions, putting "tui" for "qui" in Varro, De ling. Lat. 7, 3 (Müller).

6. Pp. 189-92. Book-notices.

7. *Revue des Revues*, pp. 209-322.

V, No. 1 (Jan.)

1. Pp. 1-57. De Plutarchi codice Matritensi iniuria neglecto (C. Graux). This article is of great importance for special study of Plutarch's Lives.

2. Pp. 58-61. Notes on the Medea of Euripides (G. Vitelli). V. 798: for ὅντε μοι read οὐ γέ μοι. V. 1109: read εἰ κυρώσει | δαιμών οὐτως. V. 106: ἀγχαις (with Weil). V. 345: for εἰκός σ' ἐστιν εἴνοιδν σ' ἔχειν read εἰκός δέ σφιν κτέ. [I should prefer εἰκός δ' ἐγ νιν κτέ., in spite of the rare use of νιν in the plural].

3. Pp. 61-63. R. Cagnat shows that in Symmachus, Letter 60, *quinquagesimae* should be changed to *quadragesimae*, which occurs in the same connection in Letter 63.

4. Pp. 63-64. Note on Livy, V 37, 6 (O. Riemann). Something has probably fallen out between *primo* and *adventu*: possibly it should be *prim(o sub ips)o adventu*.

5. Pp. 65-84. Remarks on Aeschylus (H. Weil). Discussion of nearly fifty passages, with numerous emendations.

6. Pp. 85-101. Critical remarks upon Cic. de Officiis, based upon a MS. of Nice (C. Beldame). Points out some important variants for Book I and part of Book II, and gives a complete collation for Book I.

7. Pp. 101-102. Note on the accusative in apposition with a sentence (J. Gantrelle). Gossrau (Lateinische Sprachlehre, § 313) maintains that no instance occurs in Cicero, but G. claims to have found one in Phil. II 85: "(diadema) attuleras domo, meditatum scelus."

8. P. 102. A. Pallis changes *βίᾳ* in Soph. Philoct. 601 into *δικῇ* (or *βλάβῃ*) and reads *αιτεp* for *οἴτεp* in the next verse.

9. Pp. 103-107. Grammatical Notes (O. Riemann). Discusses Gossrau's law that *primus*, *medius*, *summus*, etc., when used partitively, always precede their substantive. R. gives a list of all the instances of such adjectives used partitively in Caesar, from which it appears that, although the rule is not invariable, the exceptions are not numerous. Some examples cited from Terence, Sallust and Livy, with some exceptions in Sallust and Livy. Several exceptions to Kühnast's rule that *media arbor* means *the middle of the tree*, and *arbor media*, *the middle tree*, the rule being rigorous (or nearly so) only for *arbor media*.

10. Pp. 108-112. Book-notices.

No. 2 (May).

1. Pp. 113-116. Observations on the Letters of Symmachus (G. Boissier). Symmachus used Pliny the Younger as a model. The fact that his letters are not interesting is due to several causes, chiefly the following: (1) The absence of important public events. (2) The unreliability of the means of sending letters, it being uncertain how long a letter would be on its way, or whether it would ever reach its destination, and there being danger that it would be read by carriers or others. On a certain day Symmachus received two letters from a friend in Africa, the one telling of his marriage, and the other announcing the birth of his child. (3) Certain documents (such as *Acta Senatus*) and also accounts of events and gossip were enclosed with the letters, not forming part of them.

2. Pp. 117-134. Palaeographic Notes (C. Graux). (1) G. opposes the view that the seventh Olympic Ode of Pindar "in golden letters" (deposited, according to Gorgon as cited by a scholiast, in the temple of Lindian Athena) was engraved on marble, and to show that it was possibly (and hence probably) written with golden ink on some fine writing material, he gives the history of such writings, as far as it can be learned from ancient allusions. (2) Discussion of the forms of the letters used in a fragment of Graeco-roman law contained on the parchment covering of a MS. found on Mt. Sinai. (3) History of the MS. of the Latin Pentateuch of Lyon. Variants of the lost Greek original restored by means of the Latin.

3. P. 134. R. Peyre inserts *alios* between *arbitror* and *alio* in Cic. ad Herennium, IV 63.

4. Pp. 135-136. E. Chatelain collates (with Orelli's text) a fragment of the oldest MS. of Cic. de Officiis.

5. Pp. 137-144. Book-notices.

6. Revue des Revues, V, pp. 1-96. Review of German periodicals for 1880 begun.

No. 3 (July).

1. Pp. 145-180. The Attic Dialect according to Inscriptions (O. Riemann). This article, designed to suggest additions and corrections for future editions of Herwerden's *Lapidum de Dialecto Attica Testimonia*, contains a large number of important facts not provided for in existing works.

2. Pp. 181-190. Life and Labors of Léonard de Spengel (Charles Thurot).

3. P. 191. Notes. (1) Gantrelle changes *orationem* into *rationem* in Cic., Phil. I, 7, 15: "... sequi . . . orationem et auctoritatem meam." (2) Le Foyer writes *fluvio* for *fluit* in Martial IV 66, 14. (3) Chatelain emends two passages in Symmachus by means of some old (1587) marginal notes taken from a now lost MS., and promises an article on these notes.

4. Pp. 192-196. Book-notices.

5. Revue des Revues, V, pp. 97-220. Germany (completed), Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Spain, United States, France (begun).

M. W. HUMPHREYS.

A CORRECTION.—A correspondent writes to ask whether Kühner did not himself correct the mistake to which allusion was made in Vol. II, No. 5, p. 87 of this Journal. Kühner does say (Vol. I, p. 285) that the dual is found only twice in Herodotus, but in Vol. II, p. 19 the false statement reappears, and only a Kühner can be allowed to correct in 1869 a mistake which a Kühner made in 1870. That Kühner has to be watched will be no news to students of Greek grammar.

B. L. G.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. B. Westermann & Co., New York for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Propertius (Sextus Aurelius). Select elegies; ed., with introd., notes and app., by J. P. Postgate. New York: *Macmillan*. 1881. 148 + 272 pp., 16mo, cl. \$1.60.

Rich (Anthony). Dictionary of Roman and Greek antiquities, etc. New York: *Appleton*. 1881. 756 pp., 8vo, cl., reduced to \$3.

BRITISH.

The following books are published in London unless otherwise indicated.

Aeschylus. The House of Atreus: being the Agamemnon, Libation Bearers, and Furies of Aeschylus. Translated into English verse by E. D. A. Morshead. Post 8vo, pp. 214. *C. Kegan Paul*. 7s.

Arnold (E.) Indian Poetry. Containing a new edition of "The Indian Song of Songs," from the Sanskrit of the Gita Govinda of Jayadeva, Two Books from "The Iliad of India" (Mahabharata), Proverbial Wisdom from the Shlokas of the Hitopadesa and other Oriental Poems. Trübner's Oriental Series. 8vo, pp. 270. *Trübner*. 7s. 6d.

Beowulf. An Old English Poem translated into modern Rhymes by H. W. Lumsden. London, 1881. 8vo, xx, pp. 114. 6m.

Brewer (J. S.) English Studies; or, Essays in English History and Literature. Edited, with a Prefatory Memoir, by Henry Wace. 8vo, pp. 498. *Murray*. 14s.

Chaucer (G.) The Prologue to the Canterbury Tales. By E. F. Willoughby. Blackie's School Classics. 12mo, pp. 112. *Blackie*. 1s. 6d.

Cummins (A. H.) A Grammar of the Old Friesic Language. Post 8vo, pp. 84. *Trübner*. 3s. 6d.

Dante's Divine Comedy: Inferno. Translated by Warburton Pike. 12mo, pp. 220. *C. Kegan Paul*. 5s.

Davies (J.) Hindu Philosophy: The Sankhya Karika of Iswara Krishna. Trübner's Oriental Series. 8vo, pp. 146. *Trübner*. 6s.

Euripides (Heracleidae). With Introduction, Analysis, etc. By Edward Anthony Beck. Pitt Press Series. 12mo, pp. 140. *Cambridge Warehouse*. 3s. 6d. New York: *Macmillan*. 90 c.

Euripides (Hippolytus). Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Appendix, by J. P. Mahaffy. 12mo, pp. 128. *Macmillan*. 3s. 6d.

Euripides (Medea). With an Introduction and Commentary by A. W. Verrall. 8vo, pp. 152. 7s. 6d. New York: *Macmillan*. \$2.

Fletcher (C. R. L.) The Development of English Prose Style: The Chancellor's Essay, 1881. 8vo, sd., pp. 32.

Gotch (F. W.) Supplement to the Fragments of the Codex Cottonianus, published by Tischendorf in his "Monumenta sacra." Together with a Synopsis of the Codex. London, 1881. 4to. *Facsimile Druck.* 9m.

Justinian. Select Titles from the Digest of Justinian. Ed. by Th. Erskine Holland and C. Lancelot Shadwell. London, 1881. 8vo, pp. 462. 16s.

Lane's Arabic-English Lexicon. Edited by Stanley Lane Poole. Vol. 9, Fasc. 1. 4to, sd. *Williams & Norgate.* 6s.

Martin (W. A. P.) The Chinese: Their Education, Philosophy, and Letters. Post 8vo, pp. 316. *Trübner.* 7s. 6d.

Mayor (Jos. B.) A Sketch of Ancient Philosophy, from Thales to Cicero. Cambridge, 1881. 12mo, pp. 266. 4s.

Müller (F. Max). Sacred Books of the East. Vol. II. Buddhist Suttas. Translated from Pali. By T. W. Rhys Davids. 8vo, pp. 368. *Frowde.* 10s.

Palmer (E. H.) The Arabic Manual. 12mo, bd., pp. 316. *W. H. Allen.* 7s. 6d.

Phrynicus (The New). Being a Revised Text of the Ecloga of the German Phrynicus. With Introduction and Commentary. By W. G. Rutherford. 8vo, pp. 530. *Macmillan.* 18s.

Plato (Euthydemus). With an Introduction and Notes. By George Henry Wells. 12mo, pp. 124. *Bell & Sons.* 4s.

Plato's Republic. Translated into English, with an Analysis and Introduction, by B. Jowett. 2d ed., revised and corrected. 8vo, pp. 514. *Frowde.* 12s. 6d.

Pursuit of Diarmuid and Grainne. Part 2. 12mo, sd., pp. 210. Dublin: *Gill. Simpkin.* 1s. 6d.

Records of the Past. Vol. XII: Egyptian Texts. Post 8vo, pp. 170. *Bagster.* 3s. 6d.

Sophocles. Edited with English Notes and Introductions by Lewis Campbell. 2 vols. Vol. II, Ajax; Electra; Trachiniae; Philoctetes; Fragments. 8vo, pp. 592. *Frowde.* 16s.

Thucydides. Translated into English, with Introduction, Marginal Analysis, Notes, and Indices, by B. Jowett. 2 vols. 8vo, pp. 1270. *Frowde.* 32s. New York: *Macmillan.* \$8.

The Vinaya Pitakam. Ed. by H. Oldenberg. Vol. III: The Suttavibhanga. I: Parajika, Samghadisesa, Anayata Nissaggiya. 8vo, 343 pp. 25m.

FRENCH.

Barbier de Meynard (A. C.) Dictionnaire turc-français. Supplément aux dictionnaires publiés jusqu'à ce jour. Tome I. I. livraison. Gr. in-8. *Leroux.* 10 fr.

Cordier (Henri). Bibliotheca Sinica. Dictionnaire bibliographique des ouvrages relatifs à l'empire chinois. Tome I. Gr. in-8. *Leroux.* 60 fr.

Dictionnaire pongoué-français, précédé des Principes de la langue pongouée. In-12. *Maisonneuve.* 10 fr.

Gilliéron (Jules). Petit atlas phonétique du Valais roman (sud du Rhône). In-8. *Champion.* 6 fr.

Grammaire coréenne. Gr. in-8. (Yokohama) *Leroux.* 45 fr.

Lamber (J.) Poètes grecs contemporains. Paris, 1881. 18mo, lii, 309 pp. 3m. 50.

Legrand (Émile). Bibliothéque grecque vulgaire. Tome II et III. Gr. in-8. *Maison neuve*. 20 fr.

Ménard (R.) La Vie privée des anciens. Dessins d'après les monuments antiques par C. Sauvageot. La Famille dans l'antiquité. Paris, 1881. 8vo, 575 pp. Mit 815 Illustr. 100 fr.

Pierret (Paul). Le Décret trilingue de Canope. Transcription et interprétation interlinéaire, etc. In-4. *Leroux*. 7 fr. 50.

Reiff (C. Ph.) Petit manuel de la langue russe. In-32 oblong. *Maison neuve*. Cart., 2 fr.

Waltz (Ad.) Des variations de la langue et de la métrique d'Horace dans ses différents ouvrages. In-8. *Baer*. 5 fr.

GERMAN.

Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes. VII Bd., Nr. 4. Leipzig, 1881. *Brockhaus' Sortiment u. Antiq.* 8vo, lxiv, 597 pp. 32m. Inhalt: Das Saptaçatakam des Håla. Herausgegeben von Albert Weber.

Acta seminarii philologici Erlangensis. Edd. Iwanus Mueller et Ed. Woelflin. Vol. II. gr. 8. (529 S.) Erlangen. *Deichert*. n. 9.—(I. et II.: n. 17.—).

Allers (Wilh., de L. A.) Senecae librorum de ira fontibus. Diss. gr. 8. (77 S.) Göttingen. *Akadem. Buchh. in Comm.* baar n. 1. 50.

Appiani historia romana, ed. Ludov. Mendelssohn. Vol. II. 8. (vi u. 565-1227 S.) Leipzig. *Teubner*. (à) 4. 50.

Archimedis opera omnia cum commentariis Eutocii. Latine vertit notisque illustravit J. L. Heiberg. Vol. II. 8. (viii, 468 S. m. 1. *Lichtdr.-Fcsm.*) Leipzig. *Teubner*. (à) 6.

Aristophanis Plutus, rec. Adph. v. Velsen. gr. 8. (vi, 85 S.) Leipzig. *Teubner*. n. 2.

Bauer (Dr. Adf.) Themistokles. Studien u. Beiträge zur griech. Historiographie u. Quellenkunde. gr. 8. (v, 173 S.) Merseburg. *Steffenhagen*. n. 3.

Bibliotheca philologica classica. Beiblatt zum Jahresbericht üb. die Fortschritte der class. Alterthumswissenschaft. 8 Jahrg. 1881. 4 Hfte. gr. 8. (1 Hft. 110 S.) Berlin. *Calvary & Co.* n. 6.

Bischoff (Fr.) Der Conjunctiv bei Chrestien. 8vo, iv, 126 pp. Halle, 1881. *Niemeyer*. 3. 60.

Bitschofsky (Dr. Rud.) De C. Sollii Apollinaris Sidonii studiis Statianis. gr. 8. (87 S.) Wien. *Konegen*. n. 1. 60.

Brandt (Karl). Quaestiones Propertianae. Dissertatio inauguralis. gr. 8. (50 S.) Berlin, 1880. *Mayer & Müller*. baar n. 1. 20.

Bräuning (Th. F. G.) De adjectivis compositis apud Pindarum. 4. (66 S.) Berlin. *Calvary & Co.* baar n. 2. 40.

Breska (Adsv.) Untersuchungen über die Quellen des Polybius im 3 Buche. 8vo, 98 pp. Berlin, 1880. *Mayer & Müller*. 1. 60.

Büdinger (Max). Apollinaris Sidonius als Politiker. Eine universalhistor. Studie. Lex.-8. (42 S.) Wien. *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* n. —60.

Büdinger (Max). Die neuentdeckten Inschriften üb. Cyrus. Eine krit. Untersuchg. Lex.-8. (17 S.) Ebd. n. —40.

Büdinger (Max). Cicero und der Patriciat. Eine staatsrechtliche Untersuchung. 4to, 66 pp. Wien, 1881. *Gerold's Sohn*. 3. 20.

Bugge (Prof. Sophus). Studien üb. die Entstehung der nordischen Götter- u. Helden sagen. Vom Verf. autoris. u. durchgeseh. Uebersetzg. Osc. Brenner. 1 Reihe. (In 3 Hftn.) 1 Hft. gr. 8. (96 S.) München. *Kaiser*. n. 2.

Cohn (Leop.) De Aristophane Byzantio et Suetonio Tranquillo Eustathi auctoribus. gr. 8. (92 S.) Leipzig. *Teubner*. n. 2.

Corpus inscriptionum latinarum. Consilio et auctoritate academie literarum regiae borussicae editum. Vol. VIII. 2 partes. *Inscriptiones Africæ latinae*. Collegit Gust. Wilmanns. 2 partes. Imp.-4. Berlin. *G. Reimer*. Cart. n. 96. (I-VI, 1. VII et VIII: n. 581, 75). Inhalt: 1. *Inscriptiones Africæ pro-consularis et Numidia comprehendens*. (xxxviii, 714 S.) 2. *Inscriptiones Mauretaniarum*. (715-1141 S. m. 3 chromolith. Karten.)

Deecke (W.) und Pauli (C.) Etruskische Forschungen und Studien. 1 Heft. 8vo, vi, 94 pp. Stuttgart, 1881. *Heitz*. 5m. Inhalt: Etruskische Studien. Von C. Pauli. 4 Heft. 1. Noch einmal die *lautni*- und *etera*-Frage. 2. Nachträge und Neues in Bezug auf *arnθial* und *larθial* und ihre Verwandten.

Dilthey (Carl). De epigrammatis nonnullis graecis disputatio. 4. (12 S.) Göttingen. *Dieterich's Verl.* baar n. —80.

Edzardi (Ant.) Die Saga v. den Volsungen u. Nibelungen. 8. (xvi, 123 S.) Stuttgart. *Heitz*. n. 2.

Ehrenthal (Ludw.) Quaestiones Frontonianaæ. *Dissertatio inauguralis*. gr. 8. (54 S.) Königsberg. *Hartung*. baar n. 1. 80.

Forcellini (Aegid.) Totius latinitatis lexicon. Pars altera opera et studio Dr. Vinc. De-Vit. Distr. 18. gr. 4. (2 Bd. 577-656 S.) Prati. Leipzig. *Brockhaus' Sort.* (à) n. 2. 50.

Gebhard (Frdr.) De Plutarchi in Demosthenis vita, fontibus ac fide. Diss. gr. 8. (55 S.) Monochii, 1880. Leipzig. *O. Schulze*. n. 1. 50.

Gerber (A.) et Greef (A.) Lexicon Taciteum. Fasc. IV. Lex.-8. (337-480 S.) Leipzig. *Teubner*. (à) n. 3. 60.

Glaser (Dr. E.) Vergilius als Naturdichter u. Theist. 8. (viii, 231 S.) Gütersloh, 1880. *Bertelsmann*. n. 2. 50.

Goebel (Dr. Karl). Üb. den Platonischen Parmenides. gr. 8. (iv, 84 S.) Gütersloh, 1880. *Bertelsmann*. n. 1. 20.

Graeber (Dr. Gust.) Quaestiorum Ovidianarum pars I. 4. (93 S.) Elberfeldae. Berlin. *Weidmann in Comm.* n. 1. 60.

Grill (Prof. Dr.) Hundert Lieder d. Atharya-Veda, übers. u. m. Bemerkgn. versehen. 4. (72 S.) Tübingen, 1879. Leipzig. *O. Schulze*. n. 2. 50.

Handbibliothek (philologische). 1 Lfg. gr. 8. Berlin. *Weidmann*. n. 1. Inhalt: Römische Geschichte v. Thdr. Mommsen. 7 Aufl. (1 Bd. 1-96 S.)

Hartmann (v. Aue.) Der arme Heinrich. Il povero Enrico. Versione in prosa di Aristide Baragiola. gr. 8. (iv, 45 S.) Strassburg. *Trübner*. n. 1. 20.

Hartmann (Felix). De Aoristo secundo. gr. 8. (71 S.) Berlin. *Weidmann*. n. 1. 20.

Haupt (Jos.) Von dem Verhältnisse der Dichtung u. Geschichte nach Aristoteles. gr. 8. (31 S.) Wien. *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* n.n. —30.

Haupt (Dr. Paul). Der keilinschrifliche Sintfluthbericht. Eine Episode d. babylon. Nimrodepos. Mit dem autogr. Keilschrifttext d. babylon. Sintfluth-fragmentes. gr. 8. (vi, 30 S.) Leipzig. *Hinrichs' Verl.* n. 2.

Hofmann (Konr.) Altburgundische Uebersetzung der Predigten Gregors üb. Ezechiel. gr. 4. (126 S.) München. *Franz in Comm.* n.n. 5.

Hommel (Fritz). Die Semiten u. ihre Bedeutg. f. die Kulturgeschichte. Mit 3 Farbenkärtchen zur Veranschaulichg. der semit. Sprachentwicklg. u. e. pkysikal. (chromo-lith.) Karte der semit. Länder. gr. 8. (viii, 68 S.) Leipzig. *O. Schulze.* n. 2.

Hultsch (Frdr.) Heraion u. Artemision, zwei Tempelbauten Ioniens. Ein Vortrag. gr. 8. (52 S.) Berlin. *Weidmann.* n. 1. 50.

Humperdinck (G.) Die Vocale u. die phonetischen Erscheinungen ihres Wandels in Sprachen und Mundarten. gr. 8. (45 S.) Siegburg, 1874. Bonn. *Behrendt.* —60.

Jahresbericht üb. die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der germanischen Philologie, hrsg. v. der Gesellschaft f. deutsche Philologie in Berlin. 2 Jahrg. 1880. gr. 8. (iii, 307 S.) Berlin. *Calvary & Co.* n. 8.

Jarnik (Dr. Joh. Urb.) Zur albanischen Sprachenkunde. gr. 8. (51 S.) Leipzig. *Brockhaus' Sort in Comm.* n. 2.

Kaluža (Max). Üb. das Verhältniss d. mittelenglischen allitterirenden Gedichtes 'William of Palerne' zu seiner französischen Vorlage. I. Inaugural-Dissertation. gr. 8. (36 S.) Breslau. *Köhler.* baar n. 1.

Kayser's (K. L.) Homerische Abhandlungen. Hrsg. v. Herm. Usener. gr. 8. (ii, 106 S.) Leipzig. *Teubner.* n. 3.

Klein (Jos.) Fasti consulares inde a Caesaris nece usque ad imperium Diocletiani. gr. 8. (viii, 130 S.) Leipzig. *Teubner.* Cart., n. 4.

Klimke. Diodorus Siculus und die römische Annalistik. 4to, 40 pp. Königshütte, 1881. *Lowack.* 2.

Koffmane (G.) Geschichte des Kirchenlateins. I Bd. 2 Heft. 8vo, 93-168 pp. Breslau, 1881. *Koebner.* 1. 80.

König (Dr. Frdr. Ed.) Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache. 1 Hälfte. Lehre v. der Schrift, der Aussprache, dem Pronomen u. dem Verbum. gr. 8. (x, 710 S.) Leipzig. *Hinrichs' Verl.* n. 16.

Koran (der). Nach dem Arab. Orig.-Mscr. v. Ali Ahkali geschrieben v. Hafiz Osman [im J. 1094 der Hedschra]. Phototypograf. Reproduction. 8. (876 S. m. chromolith. Titel.) Geb. m. Goldschn. London. München. *Franz in Comm.* n.n. 30.

Kunert (Rud.) Quae inter Clitophontem dial. et Platonis rempubl. intercedat necessitudo. Diss. gr. 8. (37 S.) *Gryphiswaldiae.* Berlin. *Mayer & Müller.* baar n. 1.

Laves. Kritisch-exegetische Beiträge zu Virgils 6 und 10 Ecloge, sowie zum 1 Buche der Georgica. 4to, 15 pp. Lyck, 1881. *Wiebe.* 1.

Lewin (Dr. Herm.) Das mittelenglische Poema morale. Im krit. Text, nach den 6 vorhandenen Handschriften zum ersten Male hrsg. gr. 8. (78 S.) Halle. *Niemeyer.* n. 2.

Mahn (A.) Ueber die Entstehung der italiänischen Sprache. 8vo, 40 pp. Berlin, 1881. *Dümmler's Verl.* 1.

Martialis (M. Valer). *Epigrammaton librum I rec., commentariis instruxit*
Joa. Flach. gr. 8. (xxiv, 119 S.) Tübingen. *Laupp.* n. 3.

Meyer (P.) *Die Frage der Echtheit des Briefwechsels Cicero ad Brutum.*
8vo, viii, 210 pp. Stuttgart, 1881. *Knapp.* 2. 40.

Miklosich (Dr. Frz.) *Rumunische Untersuchungen. I. Istro- u. Macedo-*
rumun. Sprachdenkmäler. Imp.-4. (92 S.) Wien. *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* n. 4.

Minucius Felix (M.) Octavius. *Ein Dialog, übers. v. Bernh. Dombart.* 2
Ausz. 8. (xvi, 142 S.) Erlangen. *Deichert.* n. 2. 40.

Mittheilungen, archäologisch-epigraphische, aus Oesterreich. Hrsg. v. O.
Benndorf u. O. Hirschfeld. 5 Jahrg. 1881. gr. 8. (1 Hft. 140 S. m. 4 Taf. in
Heliogravure.) Wien. *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* n. 9.

Möbius (Th.) Hattatal Snorra Sturlusonar. II. Gedicht u. Commentar.
gr. 8. (140 S.) Halle. *Buchh. d. Waisenh.* n. 2. 80 (I. u II.: n. 5. 20).

National-Bibliothek, russische. Hrsg. vom russ. literar. Bureau. Inter-
linear-Uebersetzg. Accentuirter Text. 2 Jahrg. 12 Hfte. 1½ B. gr 8.
Leipzig. *Gerhard.* baar 10.; einzelne Hfte. à 1.

Paucker (C.) *De latinitate B. Hieronymi. Editio adjecto indice auctior.*
8vo, iv, 189 pp. Berlin, 1880. *Calvary & Co.* 10.

Pauly (Dr. Frz.) *Die handschriftliche Ueberlieferung d. Salvianus.* Lex.-8.
(41 S.) Wien. *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* n. —60.

Petschar (M.) *De Horatii poesi lyricali.* Pars II. Lex. 8. (20 S.) Teschen.
Prochaska. n. —80 (I. et II.: n. 2).

Pfizmaier (A.) *Die japanischen Werke aus den Sammlungen der Häuser.*
4to, 98 pp. Wien, 1881. *Gerold's Sohn.* 4.

Pflügl (Studienlehr. Frz. Xav.) *Das lateinische Sprichwort bei Plautus u.*
Terenz. gr. 8. (44 S.) Straubing, 1880. Leipzig. *O. Schulze.* n. 2. 50.

Plauti (T. Macci). *Comoediae. Rec., etc. Frdr. Ritschelius, sociis operae*
adsumptis Gust. Loewe, Geo. Goetz, Frdr. Schoell. Tomi I fasc. 4. *Asinaria.*
Rec. Geo. Goetz. et Gust. Loewe. Accedit codicis Ambrosiani J infer. spe-
cimen phototypicum. gr. 8. (xxvi, 110 S.) Leipzig. *Teubner.* n. 3. 60 (I, 1
—4: n. 13. 40).

Poetae latini minores. Rec. et emendavit Aemil Baehrens. Vol. III. 8.
(308 S.) Leipzig. *Teubner.* 3. (I—III: 7. 50).

Polyglott vocabulary, a, english, german, canarese, Tulu and Malayalam,
containing 1600 words, etc. Tentative ed. 8. (xvi, 98 S.) Mangalore, 1880.
Basel. *Missionsbuchh.* Cart., n. 2. 40.

Pökel (W.) *Philologisches Schriftsteller-Lexikon.* 1 Lfg. gr. 8. (64 S.)
Leipzig. *A. Krüger.* n. 1.

Polak (H. J.) *Fasc. I. Emendationes ad scholia in Homeri Odysseam.*
gr. 8. (viii, 275 S.) Leiden. *Brill.* n.n. 6.

Preuss (Dr. Siegism). *De bimembris dissoluti apud scriptores romanos usu*
sollemni. gr. 8. (:23 S.) Edenkoben. Tübingen. *Heckenauer.* n. 2.

Rabbinovitz (Raph.) *Variae lectiones in Mischnam et in Talmud babylo-*
nicum. Pars XI. *Tract. Baba Bathra.* 8vo, 517 pp. München, 1881. *Ros-*
enthal. 9.

Reinisch (Leo). *Die Kunama-Sprache in Nordost-Afrika.* Lex.-8. (90 S.)
Wien. *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* n. 1. 40.

Ribbeck (Otto). Friedrich Wilhelm Ritschl. 2 Bd. Mit e. (Lichtdr.-) Bildniss Ritschls. gr. 8, (x, 591 S.) Leipzig. *Teubner.* n. 12. (cpl.: n. 19, 20).

Ritter (Constantin). Die Quintilianischen Declamationen. Mit 2 Fcsm.-Drucken in Holzschn. u. 4 Tab. gr. 8. (xiv, 275 S.) Freiburg i/Br. *Mohr.* n. 8.

Rosserberg (Kr.) Deutsche Lehnwörter in alphabetischer Anordnung. 8vo, ix, 120 pp. Hagen, 1881. *Risel.* 3.

Sachau (Ed.) Ueber die Lage von Tigranokerta. Mit 2 chromolith. Karten. 4to, 92 pp. Berlin, 1881. *Dümmler's Verl.* 5.

Schaefer (Arnold). Abriss der Quellenkunde der griechischen u. römischen Geschichte. 2 Abtlg. Die Periode d. röm. Reichen. gr. 8. (199 S.) Leipzig. *Teubner.* n. 3 (1 u. 2: n. 5).

Schippke (Aemil). De speculis etruscis quaestionum particula I. Diss. gr. 8. (45 S.) Breslau. *Köhler.* baar n. 1.

Schlesische Denkmäler des deutschen Schrifttums im Mittelalter, herausgegeben von P. Pietsch. I. 8vo, cxx, 136 pp. Breslau, 1881. *Koebner.* 6. 40. Inhalt: Trebnitzer Psalmen, herausgegeben von P. Pietsch.

Schliemann (Dr. Heinr.) Orchomenos. Bericht üb. meine Ausgrabn. im böot. Orchomenos. Mit 9 (eingedr. Holzschn.-) Abbildgn. u. 4 (lith.) Taf. gr. 8. (vi, 58 S.) Leipzig. *Brockhaus.* n. 3.

Schönbach (Ant.) Mittheilungen aus altdeutschen Handschriften. 3 Stück: Neue Fragmente d. Gedichtes üb. die Zerstörg. v. Accon. Lex.-8. (12 S.) Wien. *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* n.n.—30 (1—3: n.n. 2, 10).

Schulbaum (Moses). Neues vollständiges deutsch-hebräisches Wörterbuch m. Berücksicht. der talmudischen u. neuhebräischen Literatur. gr. 8. (vi, 468 S.) Lemberg. Wien. *D. Löwy.* baar n. 5.

Schwartz (Ed.) De scholiis Homericis ad historiam fabularem pertinentibus. Aus: "Jahrbb. f. class. Philol. 12 Suppl.-Bd." gr. 8. (61 S.) Leipzig. *Teubner.* n. 1. 60.

Schweizerisches Idiotikon. Wörterbuch der schweizerdeutschen Sprache. I Heft. Bearbeitet von F. Staub und L. Tobler. 4to, xxx, 128 pp. Frauenfeld, 1881. *Huber.* 2.

Servii Grammatici qui seruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii rec. Geo. Thilo et Herm. Hagen. Vol. I. Fasc. II. In Aeneidos libros IV et V commentarii. gr. 8. (xcviii u. 459–660 S.) Leipzig. *Teubner.* n. 10. (I, 1 et 2: n. 24).

Speculum regale. Ein altnorweg. Dialog. Hrsg. v. Osc. Brenner. gr. 8. (xvi, 212 S.) München. *Kaiser.* n. 5.

Steup (Jul.) Thukydideische Studien. 1 Heft. 8vo, vii, 92 pp. Freiburg i. Br., 1881. *Mohr.* 2. 40.

Studien (Leipziger). Zur classischen Philologie. Hrsg. v. G. Curtius, L. Lange, O. Ribbeck, H. Lipsius. 4 Bd. 1 Hft. gr. 8. (156 S.) Leipzig. *Hirzel.* n. 4.

Sydow (Rud.) De recensendis Catulli carminibus. Dissertatio inauguralis philologica. gr. 8. (77 S.) Berlin. *Mayer & Müller.* baar n. 1. 50.

Teichmüller (Gst.) Literarische Fehden im vierten Jahrhundert vor Chr. 8vo, xvi, 310 pp. Breslau, 1881. *Koebner.* 8.

Terentius Afer (P.) Ausgew. Komödien v. Carl Dziatzko. 2 Bdchn.: Adelphoe. gr. 8. (114 S.) Leipzig. *Teubner.* 1. 50 (1 u. 2: 2. 70.).

Theokrits Gedichte. Erklärt v. Herm. Fritzsche. 3 Aufl. Besorgt v. Ed. Hiller. gr. 8. (iv, 364 S.) Leipzig. *Teubner.* 2. 70.

Trumpp (E.) Grammatische Untersuchungen über die Sprache der Brähüls. 8vo, 125 pp. München, 1881. *Th. Ackermann.* 4.

Trumpp (E.) Der arabische Sazbau nach der Anschauung der arabischen Grammatiker. 8vo, 90 pp. München, 1879. *Th. Ackermann.* 3. 60.

Turmair's (Jhs.) Gen. Aventinus, sämmtliche Werke. I Bd. Kleinere historische und philologische Schriften. 2 Hälften. 8vo, lix u. 373-671 pp. München, 1881. *Kaiser.* 7. 80.

Vahlen (J.) Ueber die Anfänge der Heroïden des Ovid. 4to, 40 pp. Berlin, 1881. *Dümmler's Verl.* 1. 50.

Vaniček (Alois). Etymologisches Wörterbuch der lateinischen Sprache. 2 umgearb. Aufl. gr. 8. (vii, 388 S.) Leipzig. *Teubner.* n. 6.

Van Leeuwen (J.) Commentatio de authentia et integritate Aiacis Sophoclei. 8vo, XVI, 203 pp. Trajecti ad Rhenum, 1881. 4. 50.

Vogel (Thdr.) De dialogi, qui Taciti nomine fertur, sermone judicium. gr. 8. (34 S.) Leipzig. *Teubner.* n. 1. 20.

Wagner (feu Prof. W.) Trois poèmes grecs du moyen-âge inédits, recueillis. Avec. le portr. (photogr.) de l'auteur. gr. 8. (xx, 349 S.) Berlin. *Calvary & Co.* n. 12.

Wentzel (Herm.) De Juba metrico. Part I. 4. (17 S.) Oppeln. Breslau. Koeber. baar n. 1.

Wieseler (F.) Scenische und kritische Bemerkungen zu Euripides' Kyklops. 4to, 37 pp. Göttingen, 1881. *Dieterich's Verl.* 2.

Winter (Dr. J.) Üb. die metrische Reconstruction der Plautinischen Cantica. gr. 8. (80 S.) München, 1880. Leipzig. *O. Schulze.* n. 1. 50.

Wrampelmeyer (H.) Codex Wolfenbuttelanus Nr. 205, olim Helmstadiensis Nr. 304, primum ad complures Ciceronis orationes collatus. Pars V et VI. gr. 4. Clausthaliae. Hannover. *Schmorl & v. Seefeld.* baar n. 3. 20 (I-VI: n. 8.). V. (48 S.) 1880. n. 2.—VI. Addita sunt complura de eod. Cic. epist. ad famili. adhuc incognito. (46 S.) n. 1. 20.

Zeitschrift f. ägyptische Sprache u. Alterthumskunde. Hrsg. v. C. R. Lepsius unter Mitwirkg. v. H. Brugsch. 18 Jahrg. 1881. 4 Hfste. Hoch 4 (1 Hft. 24 S. m. 5 Steintaf. u. 1 Plan in Lichtdr.) Leipzig. *Hinrichs' Verl.* n. 15.

Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie u. Sprachwissenschaft. Hrsg. v. Proff. DD. M. Lazarus u. H. Steinthal. 13 Bd. 4 Hfste. gr. 8. (1 u. 2 Hft. 200 S.) Berlin. *Dümmler's Verl.* à Hft. n. 2. 40.

Zeitschrift f. romanische Philologie. Hrsg. v. Prof. Dr. Gust. Gröber. 5 Bd. gr. 8. (1 Hft. 180 S.) Halle. *Niemeyer.* n. 20.

Zimmer (Heinr.) Keltische Studien. 1 Hft. Irische Texte m. Wörterbuch v. E. Windisch. gr. 8. (143 S.) Berlin. *Weidmann.* n. 3.

Zingerle (Prof. Dr. Ant.) Zu den Persius-Scholien. Lex.-8. (32 S.) Wien. *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* n.n.—50.

Zirwik (Prof. P. Mich.) O. S. B., Studien üb. griechische Wortbildung. Specieller Thl. gr. 8. (105-232 S.) Salzburg. Würzburg. *Woerl in Comm.* (a) n. 2.

ITALIAN.

Fiogetto (Gi.) Gli Umanisti, o lo studio del latino e del greco nel secolo XV in Italia. 16mo, 170 pp. Verona, 1881. *Appunti.* 3.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Nikolásdrapa Halls Prests. An Icelandic Poem from c. A. D. 1400. By Wm. H. Carpenter, Ph. D. Halle, 1881.

Hieroglyphic Tables of Pompeium. Grammatically translated and commented on. By Prof. Gustav Seyffurth, Ph. and Th. D. (Transactions of St. Louis Academy of Sciences, April 27, 1881).

De Hercule Homerico. Scripsit Alfredus Emerson. Diss. inaug. Monachii, 1881.

Anglo-Saxon Version of the Epistola Alexandri ad Aristotelem. Diss. By William Malone Baskerville. Halle, 1881.

Hübner (Prof. E.) Ueber mechanische Copieen von Inschriften. Berlin: Weidmann, 1881.

Elementary German. By Charles P. Otis. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1881.

Thucydides. Translated into English, with Introduction, Marginal Analysis, Notes and Indices. By B. Jowett, M. A. Oxford: Clarendon Press. New York: Macmillan & Co. 2 vols. \$8.

Alfranzösische Bibliothek. Herausg. v. Dr. Wendelin Förster. 4 Band. Inhalt: Lothringischer Psalter zum ersten mal herausg. v. Friederich Apfelstedt. Heilbronn: Verlag. von Gebr. Henninger, 1881. 6m.

Deutsche Litteraturdenkmale des 18ten Jahrhunderts: Voltaire am Abend seiner Apotheose v. H. L. Wagner. 40 pp. Heilbronn: Gebr. Henninger, 1881.

Französische Studien. Herausg. v. G. Körting u. E. Koschwitz. Band I. Heft 2. 4 m. 80 pf. Heft 3. 7 m. 20 pf. Band II. 12 m. Heilbronn: Gebr. Henninger, 1881.

Französische Neudrucke: De Villiers, Le Festin de Pierrre. Neue Ausg. v. W. Knörich. Heilbronn: Gebr. Henninger, 1881.

Ancient Philosophy (Sketch of) from Thales to Cicero. By Joseph B. Mayor, A. M. Cambridge: At the University Press. New York: Macmillan & Co., 1881. 90c.

Haldeman (Samuel Stehman). A memoir by Charles Henry Hart. Reprinted from the Penn Monthly, Aug. 1881.

Aryo-semitic Speech. A study of Linguistic Archaeology. By James Frederick McCurdy. Andover: W. F. Draper. \$2.

Shakespeare's Tragedy of Cymbeline, with Introductions, etc. By Rev. Henry N. Hudson. Boston: Ginn & Heath, 1881. 65c.

Shakespeare's Tragedy of Coriolanus. By the same. Boston: Ginn & Heath, 1881. 65c.

Aeschylus, Agamemnon. With Introduction and Notes. By A. Sidgwick, M. A. Oxford: Clarendon Press. New York: Macmillan & Co. 75c.

The publications of Messrs. Macmillan are received through Messrs. Cushing & Bailey, 262 W. Baltimore Street.